The Testimony of the Prayer Book to the Continuity of the Church.

By the Rev. H. Oberly, D.

LIT
3600.2
Ob2

Class Lit 3600.2 Book .O62

General Theological Seminary Library

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK.

Besides the main topic, this book also treats of

Subject No.	*On page*	*Subject No.*	*On page*

PRESENTED BY

the author

Compliments of
the Author.

Nov. 14, 1901.

The Testimony of the Prayer-Book to the Continuity of the Church.

BY THE REVEREND
H. H. OBERLY, D.D.,
AUTHOR OF
"LESSONS ON THE PRAYER-BOOK CATECHISM."

GEN THEO SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

NEW YORK
Edwin S. Gorham, Publisher
CHURCH MISSIONS HOUSE
1901.

31002

Lit
3600x
062

COPYRIGHTED BY
EDWIN S. GORHAM,
A.D. 1901.

GEN THEO SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

Contents.

I. The Rule for Interpreting the Prayer Book.

II. The Origin of the Prayer Book.

III. The Book of 1549.—The Liturgy.

IV. The Book of 1549.—The Choir Offices.

V. The Book of 1552.

VI. The Omitted Rubrics.

VII. The Popular Attitude toward the Reformation.

VIII. The Causes of Heresy in the Sixteenth Century.

IX. The Catholic Reaction.

X. The American Book of 1789.

XI. The Memorial Papers.

XII. The Revision of 1892.

XIII. Some Observations.

XIV. Choirs and Music.

XV. The Mediaeval Tendency.

Preface.

The identity of the Church of England of the present day with the Church of England of former centuries has been proved by many writers and by many lines of argument. An array of formidable evidence has been presented to show the continuity of the Church from the date of S. Augustine, through the early centuries, through the middle age, through the Reformation period, through the rebellion and the restoration, even to this year of grace. Some writers have based their arguments on doctrine, some on polity, some on episcopal succession, some on acts of parliament and royal injunctions, some on traditions, some on deeds of real estate, and some on the facts of history. The present author has undertaken to furnish a chain of evidence from a source not often explored, viz., the Prayer Book.

A large and varied literature has grown up around this marvellous Book, and authors have studied it from many points of view. It has been considered liturgically, devotionally, doctrinally

and historically, and much has been written about its literary style. And yet but scant attention has been drawn to its value as testimony to the continuity of the Church; but little notice has been taken of its positive internal evidence, and almost none of its negative evidence, its omissions, its significant silences.

Unless the Book of Common Prayer be studied as the formulated order of worship of a Church that changes from age to age, but never ceases to exist for a single instant of time, the Book cannot be fully understood. As an isolated Missal, Breviary and Office Book it is incomplete, often indefinite, and sometimes contradictory. But considered as the manual of worship of a Church that never fails in its organic quality or its catholic character, whatever may be the trials or circumstances of this age or that, the Book becomes a thermometer that registers the mutations of faith, and zeal, and learning, and devotion; a sensitive photographic plate that catches and records the acts of each successive period. The continuous life of the Church is preserved in epitome in the pages of the Prayer Book, and presented to us whenever

we open its covers. Every Eucharist or daily Office, every Baptism or Marriage or Burial, places us in instant contact with the saints and divines, the clergy and the people of the ages long gone by. Every service bears testimony to the Communion of Saints by its words, its arrangements of parts, its attendant ceremonial, or its omissions. There are portions dropped from all the services that must be sought for in the past, and which will be found in what was then, and still is, the living worship of the Church. This Book is part of our inheritance as members of Christ's Holy Church. It was not created by any body of men at any time, but has grown and developed according to the needs of successive generations, until it comes to us to-day a priceless treasure of devotion. And yet it is imperfect by itself, and only complete when accepted as the worship of the ceaseless Church, with the voice of the Church speaking through the spaces of its omissions, and with the fragrance of devotion ascending amidst its silences.

CHRIST CHURCH RECTORY, ELIZABETH, N. J.

June 19, 1901.

The Testimony of the Prayer-Book to the Continuity of the Church.

I.

The Rule of Interpretation.

The somewhat unusual interest in the affairs of the English and American Churches which is being exhibited at this time has directed attention to the Prayer Book as the standard of the Church's doctrine and ritual. Appeal is made to the Book in perfect fairness and sincerity by the contending parties for justification of their teaching and practices. There is shown no desire on the part of anyone to alter the Book to suit his views, nor to deny its authority; and yet both parties claim to represent the integrity of the Book.

The fearlessness of these appeals arrests one's attention, and calls for a fresh and critical examination of the Book of Common Prayer. We

are, perhaps, in a better position to-day than ever before to make such an examination, for within recent years new information, brought out by historical research, has been placed before us respecting the men and the events of the sixteenth century in England. And besides this, we are sufficiently removed from the agitating surges of thought of the early years of the Catholic Revival to be able to view dispassionately the work and the effects of that movement. The connection between these two statements may not be immediately apparent; but it exists.

During the whole of the eighteenth century, and almost to nearly the middle of the nineteenth century, the Reformation was universally regarded as a Protestant movement, and the Book of Common Prayer was thought to be the intentional and deliberate exponent of those protestant principles that were attributed to all the Reformers. But the Tractarian movement attacked this belief so vigorously as first to make men angry, and then to make them inquire. The first reply to the Oxford men was invective abuse; the second reply was a somewhat anxious question whether the current belief was correct after all.

The way was thus opened for investigation, and archives were searched, ancient documents were examined, and history was read again by the light

of a new theory. The result of this careful research is the claim made to-day that the Reformers were careful to preserve the catholic character of the Church of England in its continuity, and in its doctrine, sacraments, orders, polity, worship and ritual; that they sought only to purify the Church from abuses; that whatever protestant ideas they had, they received from the Continent chiefly after the publication of the Prayer Book of 1549; and that these ideas were embodied in the book of 1552. It is a question if that book ever had a legal life, and it is known that it was never used outside of the city of London. There is no certain proof that it was ever adopted by Convocation.

The present work is a fresh study of the Prayer Book, with a candid effort to interpret it according to this rule, viz.:

1. The Reformers sought to purify the Church, and not to change or modify it in any respect.

2. They had no thought of schism in their minds.

3. They took advantage of the civil repudiation of the Papacy to make reforms.

In order properly to understand the acts of the Reformers, and to interpret the Prayer Book, we must agree that the Book is the embodiment of their beliefs and their wisdom. And we must search for

their opinions, their motives and their deeds in the Prayer Book, the canons and other authoritative decisions of Convocation. We must endeavour to discover the ecclesiastical law and the ecclesiastical traditions, rather than the enactments of Parliament and the Injunctions of the King.

Perhaps the best way of illustrating the rule of interpretation is to make a brief review of the recent archiepiscopal "Opinion" on the use of incense and processional lights.

The fatal flaw in the English Archbishops' decision is the foundation upon which the argument is made to rest. Their inquiry is not what the ecclesiastical law requires, but what the civil law allows. They do not seek to know what the Church intends, nor what she intended at the Reformation, but what the King and Parliament intended. The government might enact restrictive and repressive laws, and might enforce them upon the clergy by fine, imprisonment and deprivation of benefice, but no one can say that such laws represented the mind of the Church. As a matter of fact, great wrongs were done to the Church of England by Tudor tyranny, and many of those wrongs were continued under the Stuart dynasty. Indeed, the Church is groaning to-day under oppressive Tudor laws, enforced by the government that pays

homage to a Sovereign of the House of Coburg-Saxony.

Any clear-sighted and philosophical view of the work of the English Reformation must perceive that the Church had no thought of breaking with the Catholic Church of either the past, the present, or the future. There were but two things the Reformers had in view, and these were the rejection of the usurped authority of the Pope, and the purgation of the doctrine, worship, discipline and inner life of the Church from the errors and evils that had crept in or had been forced upon her through many generations. Every intelligent and godly man in England, whether cleric or lay, desired the removal of these corruptions with his whole heart, and he was ready to aid any possible movement that would accomplish the purification of the Church. But there was no desire to separate from the whole Catholic Church, nor any idea that removing errors would create separation. The aim and effort of the Reformers was not a new idea, nor one that they alone possessed. It had been seething in the minds of bishops, and priests, and kings, and princes all over Europe for more than a century, and one attempt after another had been made to carry the reformation of the Church into effect, but the papal power always interfered and prevented reform.

The history of that whole period is curious reading, and one is amazed at the obstinate blindness of the Pope and his court. The fatuity that refused to hear pleas and cries for reform that came from every quarter of western Christendom is so marvelous as to be almost incredible, and one is forced to say that either the Pope did not believe there was corruption, or that he did not want to begin the work of purification for fear that it would upset the Papacy itself. The first hypothesis cannot be held, for the evidence is most abundant to prove that every Pope of the period knew the true state of affairs, and we are driven to the second supposition as the true explanation of the papal attitude against reform.

The Church of England, neither in the XVI century, nor in any other, had acknowledged the papal supremacy by synodal action. That supremacy had been informally introduced into England by William the Conqueror, but it was reserved for King John to formally acknowledge it, as the price of the crown he had seized. Henry VIII. repudiated the supremacy, Mary I. reintroduced it, Elizabeth again repudiated it, James II. treacherously tried to bring his realm again under the papal domination, and lost his crown and nearly lost his head in the attempt, and then an outraged people made a law that forbade, for all time, a member of the

Roman Catholic Church to sit on the throne of England.

In all this march of history the Church of England had no part, so far as the papal authority was concerned. It was purely a matter of the State and of politics. What the Church did was to take advantage of the banishment of papal power from the realm to reform abuses and set in order her house and the lives of her children. Before Henry VIII. rejected the authority of the Pope the Church was powerless to move hand or foot; but by the act of the King she became free again.

We must repeat that the authorities of the English Church had no remotest thought of inventing a new religion, or changing any of the doctrines, ceremonies or customs that tradition had handed down from antiquity. The Reformers expressed their position very plainly and intelligently. They made the beliefs and practices of the Primitive Church the standard by which their acts were to be judged, and their constant appeal was to a General Council which should judge whether they were right or wrong.

It is evident therefore that the authorities of the Church had no idea of abolishing incense, any more than they had of forbidding the use of chasubles or copes. The argument is sometimes put forth that none of these things are mentioned

in the Prayer Book. Neither is a surplice, or a stole, or a black gown. The fact that none of these things is mentioned in our present Prayer Book, and has not been mentioned in any Prayer Book for nearly three hundred and fifty years, is a strong proof of the continuity of the Church. Some of these things are mentioned in the Book of 1549, and some are not; chasubles and copes are mentioned, and stoles and maniples are not. Candles are mentioned, and incense is not. There are some rubrics giving directions for the conduct of divine worship, but they are utterly insufficient. For example, in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist there is only one posture indicated for the people, and that is to kneel at the Confession. That rubric was inserted because the Confession was a novelty in the service. As to all the rest the people knew exactly what to do, for the service was but a translation of the Latin Mass, with a few additions and omissions. The paucity of the rubrics proves that the clergy intended no changes but such as involved reforms, and where no change was indicated none was to be made. Nothing was said about standing at the Gospel and the Creed, and therefore the people were to stand as they had been accustomed to do. Nothing was said about a stole, and therefore a stole was to be worn as usual.

Nothing was said about incense, and therefore incense was to be used in the customary manner.

We must insist again, and again, that the Reformers were neither fools nor scoundrels, and that they knew what they were about. It is true that Ridley was heretical, and that Cranmer was vacillating and weak, and that he and others yielded to the pressure of the King, and the Duke of Somerset and the plausible sectarians who flocked from the Continent to England. But the martyrs' monument in Oxford is the daily witness that these men retracted their errors and sealed their faith by giving up their lives at the fiery stake. Suppose we grant the truth of the charges brought against these men, and concede that they held erroneous belief in regard to the Holy Eucharist and Holy Orders, nevertheless such concession does not affect the claim that they believed in the continuity of the English Church, in the supreme authority of a General Council, in the necessity of membership of the Catholic Church. Unless we accept this claim we cannot understand the history of the Churches of England and America, nor can we interpret the Prayer Book.

Article XXXIV. of the Articles of Religion states: "Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's au-

thority." That is good, sober ruling, and no man can question it; but there is a limitation—the ceremony or rite must be of "man's authority." Incense lies outside of that limitation, for it is not of "man's authority." The Reformers knew this, and so they left it where it was, whatever may have been their private opinions about it. They could not afford to endanger their claim to being part of the whole Church by making such a radical change as the abolition of incense, even though they may or may not have liked it.*

There is another link in this chain of argument, and it is an important one. The Archbishops say, "It must be remembered that the Church has never spoken of incense as an evil thing." And, "We are far from saying that incense, in itself, is an unsuitable or undesirable accompaniment to Divine worship. The injunctions for its use by Divine authority in the Jewish Church would alone forbid such a conclusion."

Therefore, the Church has never condemned incense; it has been used universally in the Church for nearly two thousand years; it was commanded by Almighty God under the old Covenant, and has been continued by all parts of the Catholic Church under the new Covenant; it is neither a novelty nor

* "The use of incense without doubt existed in our own Church on the very eve of Elizabeth's first Act of Uniformity," *i.e.*, April 28, 1559.—Prof. W. Sanday, D.D.

a corruption; the English Reformers retained it; and it is the law of the Church to-day.

The point of incense is here dwelt upon, not for the purpose of giving it special prominence, but because it is convenient to use as an illustration to elucidate the principles by which the English Reformation and the Prayer Book are to be interpreted, viz.: The Church is continuous and her life is unbroken; and in evidence we produce from her history the facts of her unchanged doctrines, ceremonies, orders and customs.

In order therefore to get a right understanding of the Book of Common Prayer, it should be interpreted in accordance with the following facts:

1. The English Reformers had no thought of breaking with the historic Catholic Church.

2. They made no changes in the doctrine, discipline, or worship of the Church, but such as were required by a reformation of abuses.

3. Their aim was to cut off mediæval corruptions, and bring the English Church into conformity with the undivided Church of the early centuries.

4. They regarded the English Church as occidental in origin, character, and tone of thought.

5. They recognized no conciliar authority subsequent to Constance (A.D. 1414), when repre-

sentatives from East and West sat together for the last time.

6. The Prayer Book of 1549 was the solemn and deliberate act of the Reformers, and was intended by them to fix the status of the Church.

7. They left the ritual, ceremonies, vestments and ornaments of the Church unchanged, except in so far as they were modified by changes in the text of the services.

8. They purified and retained all the old rites.

9. They asserted the right of every national Church to ordain, modify, or abolish such ceremonies as have had their beginning by the institution of man.*

10. They conceded a personal right of opinion and action in matters of religion outside the domain of the Faith and "public" worship.†

* "Of ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained." Book of 1549.

† Confession was made voluntary. "Here shall the sick person make a special Confession, if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which Confession, the priest shall absolve him after this form; and the same form of Absolution shall be used in all private Confessions." Visitation of the Sick, 1549.

"As touching kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures, they may be made or left, as every man's devotion serveth, without blame." Certain Notes, etc. Book of 1549.

Matins and Evensong were not required to be said privately.—Colophon to Preface.—1549.

II.

The Origin of the Prayer Book.

The popular mind exhibits a curious facility in accepting some propositions and holding them with tenacity, and at the same time shows an obstinate refusal even to consider other propositions.

For an example of this mental inconsistency we need only point to the persistency with which a great many people outside the Church continue to assert that the Anglican Church was founded at the time of the Reformation. The statement has been denied again and again, and the apostolic origin of the Church and its unbroken continuity have been proved over and over, yet the error crops out with a frequency that is surprising, and in quarters where one would expect lucidity of mind instead of density.

The same sort of misconception prevails in regard to the Prayer Book. For instance, it is asserted, in defiance of facts, that the Book was an original composition; that the first Book was a tentative effort on the part of the Reformers; that it was their intention to supersede it with a protestant and radical book as soon as they thought it safe to do so; that the book was a hasty work, roughly put together; that it did not express the real opinions of the Reformers; that it was a pro-

test against Romanism; that it was a concession to those who were anxious to retain the old order of things, and so on. It is disheartening to think of traversing such an array of wrong-headed and utterly unfounded opinions, and yet they must be denied and disproved, since the truth is the exact opposite of them all.

The aim of this chapter is to show briefly and simply the source and origin of the Book of Common Prayer; but before proceeding to the argument it will be advisable to clear the ground of some of the encumbering false ideas.

Let us consider first the statement that the book was put forth as a protest against Romanism. The people of the sixteenth century did not mean what the people of the present century mean by the words Romanist and Papist. These words nowadays mean ritualism, confession, transubstantiation, invocation of the saints, purgatory, and, in general, everything that is not recognized as protestant. The Reformers understood the names Romanist and Papist to mean one who acknowledged the supremacy of the pope and conceded to him supreme spiritual and temporal power.

It must be borne in mind that the great movement which is known as the Reformation was the result of two causes, one political, the other ecclesiastical. The struggle between the popes and the

successive rulers of every kingdom in Europe had been going on for centuries. The effort of one pontiff after another had been to extend and solidify his power over nations, with the inevitable result of a conflict with nearly every sovereign who came to his throne. While this contest for political supremacy was going on abuses crept into the Church, and religion suffered. The charge is made without modification that the pope indirectly fostered these abuses, because he would not permit kings, councils or bishops to reform them, and not infrequently he cast the mantle of his protection over offenders if they belonged to religious orders. By this policy he increased the growing army of men and women who were independent of civil and ecclesiastical rulers, and responsible to the pope alone. As a result of this conflict of authority, lawlessness in Church and State, immoralities in society and heresies in religion flourished to such a degree as to alarm Europe. Cries for a reform of the Church were heard for many years before the Reformation began, and demands were made for a General Council to inquire into the errors and abuses, and to set the Church in order.* But the cries and demands were futile, for the reigning pontiff

* Two English bishops, as a deputation from the Church of England, boldly asked for reformation at the Council of Pisa, in 1409, and these demands were repeated at the Council of Constance a few years later.

either refused to call a Council, or, having promised to summon one, found an excuse to break his promise. This course was repeated so often that in time all the evils existing in the Church became associated in men's minds with the Papacy, with the claims, the encroachments and the broken promises of the popes.

The domination of the pope had been forced upon the English by King John as the price of the crown which he had usurped. There was but one man in Europe who could help John to keep the crown on his head, and that man was the Pope. The latter was only too glad to make the most of the opportunity to extend and strengthen his power. The price the King paid was the surrender of the crown to the Pope, to receive it back again as the vassal of the Pope. The English people, both as subjects and as churchmen, were always restive under the Papacy thus forced upon them. The Convocation of the Church never acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Pope over the Church of England, and the barons at Runnymede had sternly inserted in Magna Charta the words, "The Church of England is, and shall be forever free."

When Henry VIII. repudiated the authority of the Papacy he touched the popular heart. The people probably cared very little about the motive which led the King to act, whether it was zeal for

the Church, or jealousy of a claim that overtopped his own regal power, or a desire to be divorced from his wife. What gave joy to the realm, to both clerical and lay people, was the fact that the tyranny of a foreign prince had been removed, and that England was once more free.

The reformation of the Church was the logical consequence of the rejection of the Papacy. The King, Parliament and Convocation were free to act; there was no longer a question of interference from a foreign power, and no possibility of appeal from disloyal bishops, abbots or religious orders. The opportunity was seized without delay, and as every one in power knew what was needed, and was prepared to make reforms, no time was lost in bringing about such changes as seemed desirable.

The English Reformers were not bent upon revolutionary measures. They had no intention of breaking with the past, and no idea of bringing in new doctrines, or ceremonial, or any novelties in religion. They simply took advantage of the break with the Papacy to purify the Church. The men in authority in the Church were men of learning, piety and wisdom. They knew what the corruptions were, and they were scholarly enough to know what doctrines and customs were of the faith, and what were superstitious and unlawful accretions. They frankly and boldly appealed to the doctrines

and practices of the primitive Church in justification of their acts, and they claimed antiquity as the standard of their reforms.

It is not beyond the bounds of soberness to claim that this is the only historically and morally accurate rule by which to measure the Reformation. And the Prayer Book must be interpreted in the same manner, and not by the modern nebulosity of thought that confuses catholicity with post-reformation Romanism, and catholic doctrine with the decrees of the papal Council of Trent. And least of all can the Prayer Book be judged by that narrow prejudice that condemns every doctrine, rite and custom that is not found in the miscellaneous collections of Protestantism.

The Prayer Book was not an original composition, nor a hasty work, nor a tentative effort, but was a compilation from the service books which had been in use for centuries, and which had grown by the contributions of the saints and scholars of the Catholic Church through the ages. The compilers of the book had at hand a vast store of devotional wealth, and they had only to select the best. They had been trained by life-long habit in the principles of worship, and they knew, almost instinctively, how to arrange and dispose the liturgical elements at their command.

We must look further back than the middle of

the sixteenth century for the beginning of the reformed Prayer Book. The first step was taken as early as 1516, when a revised edition of the Sarum Use was published, most probably under the influence of Cardinal Woolsey. An edition, further revised, was issued in 1531.

"In 1541 another amended, and still further reformed, edition of the Salisbury Breviary was published, in the title page of which it is said to be purged from many errors. By order of Convocation (March 3, 1541) this was adopted throughout the whole province of Canterbury."* In the next year a committee was appointed by Convocation and the King to revise and reform the various service books. The committee labored for eight years, and its last work was the Book of Common Prayer, published in 1549. In 1543 they were occupied with the ceremonies of the Church. In 1544 the Litany was set forth in English, revised from a form that had been in use for a hundred and fifty years. In 1547 the "Order of Communion" was set forth. This was in the nature of an additional service for communicants, and was said after the conclusion of the Latin Mass.†

* Blunt, Ann. Pr. Bk.

† The "Order of Communion" included the exhortation, the invitation, "Ye who do truly," etc., the confession, the absolution, the prayer of access, the administration and the benediction.
It was based upon a book called "A Simple Decision con-

In support of the theory that the book of 1549 was a hasty, incomplete and crude work it has been pointed out that the rubrics are so meagre as scarcely to serve as a guide to Minister and people in public worship. Yet this insufficiency of the rubrics is one of the best proofs we could have as evidence that there was no departure from the old order. It would have been absurdly superfluous to instruct the clergy about those matters which they knew perfectly well, as for instance, to tell a priest how he should enter church, and in what part of the edifice he should read the service. That sort of incompleteness is in our own Prayer Book, and there is a good deal of it, too. But it proves the parentage of the book; it shows that it had an ancestor. In the Book of 1549 the "Order of Evensong" does not cover three pages, and such rubrics occur as this, "as before is appointed at Matins," or this, "Then the suffrages before assigned at Matins." The clergy of that day were familiar with that sort of rubric, it being quite common in the Latin books from which the Prayer Book was compiled; for example, "As at Lauds in the Nativity of the B. V. M."

cerning the Reformation of the Churches of the Electorate of Cologne," drawn up by Bucer, Melanchthon and Sarcerius, at the request of the Prince Archbishop of Cologne, and was published in 1543. The book contained hardly any protestant statements, and did not win the favour of Luther. See Pullan's "History of the Book of Common Prayer," p. 83.

The Prayer Book of 1549 was a deliberate work that had been in process of formation for many years. It expressed the mature judgment of the wisest bishops and priests as to doctrine and ritual. It preserved all that they believed was of catholic antiquity, and it rejected all that they regarded as false or injurious in the current belief or practice. There was no thought of a new religion, or a new Church, or a new mode of worship. All that the Reformers aimed at was the purification of the Church.

In order to obtain a correct and intelligent understanding of the Book of Common Prayer it is necessary to insist again and again that in the sixteenth century the Church of England was reformed, not created, and that in all points of true doctrine, discipline, worship, sacraments, orders, rites, and ceremonies it was identically the same in 1550 that it had been in 1500. There had been no break in the succession of the episcopate, no defection from the faith, no departure in any important ceremony or usage.

The great majority of the clergy, both bishops and priests, who ministered at the Church's altars in 1550 were the identical men who had ministered there in 1540. They said the same Creeds, celebrated the same Eucharist, administered the same

Baptism, used the same ritual and wore the same vestments. The church furniture and ornaments were the same under the English book that they had been under the Latin book for the eleven years preceding 1549. The only important change that had been made in the interior of church buildings was the removal of lights before shrines, pictures and statues. In a word, the Church was as Catholic in 1550 as it had been at any time in the preceding thousand years.* The only difference was its relation to the Papacy; but the Papacy was an innovation and an uncatholic corruption that had been introduced into England in 1213. The Papacy did not exist in the primitive Church. It came into existence through the circumstances created by the decadence of the Roman imperial power in Italy, and was fostered by the usurpations of ambitious bishops of Rome.

Protestantism had no part in the formation of the first English Prayer Book. It was of recent introduction into England, and had no foothold among either clergy or laity. Its growth, however, was rapid, for there was an influx of radical scholars into England in the middle of the sixteenth

* Cranmer offered to prove that "the order of the Church of England, set out by authority of Edward the Sixth, was the same that had been used in the Church for fifteen hundred years past."

century, and a vigorous correspondence was carried on by the Continental Reformers in the effort to introduce their ideas among the English. The Continentals lacked the conservatism of the Anglo-Saxons, and they had greater cause to break with the Church. If schism can ever be judged excusable, the acts of the Continental Reformers can be overlooked, because ecclesiastical abuses were far greater on the Continent than they had ever been in England. The efforts of these men to influence the English were in a large measure successful, for they succeeded in changing the opinions of a number of the clergy, the scholars and the nobles, and especially the young King and his uncle, the Protector Somerset. A revision of the Prayer Book was ordered, and a commission appointed. In 1552 they presented a new Book as their report, which was immediately sanctioned,* and ordered to replace the first Book. But it was not received with favor, and never went into general use; in fact, it was probably not used in a single church outside of London, and the Book of 1549 continued in use all over the kingdom until the death of the King on July 6, 1554, just eight months after the second Book was issued.

There was a good deal of protestantism in the

* See page 55, second paragraph.

second Book, more by implication than by direct enactment, but not enough to impair its catholicity. There were numerous changes, chiefly in the addition of those portions of the daily Offices that precede the Lord's Prayer, and in the introduction of exhortations. There were some abstractions, such as the entire omission of the Office for the Unction of the Sick, and the first part of the sentences of administration of the Holy Communion to the people.

Queen Mary succeeded to the throne on the death of her brother, and she, being a Papist, restored at once the authority of the Pope, and reintroduced the Latin services. But the Queen died in 1558, and Elizabeth became sovereign. She immediately repudiated the Papacy, and abolished the Latin services. The English Prayer Book was hastily revised, most of its objectionable protestantism was expunged, and its use was ordered at once. Another Commission was appointed for more careful work, and in 1562 a new edition of the Book was legalized, and made the order of worship for the whole realm. This Book returned in many essential points to the standard of 1549, but it was marred by some compromises.

For many years before the Reformation there had been a cry for the use of the vernacular in pub-

lic worship, because the speech of the people had become a language, and there was no longer a necessity to use Latin. There was no English language before the fifteenth century. In Chaucer's time the language was only beginning to take form, and it was not moulded into shape until the Prayer Book and the Bible fixed it.*

The Book was also accepted because it simplified public worship, and made it "common." This fact was displayed in the title of the book, "The Book of Common Prayer." The time had gone for the people to be mere spectators and auditors in church, and the time had come for them to become intelligent participants in the offices of worship. Yet they wanted nothing new or unusual. The Book gave them condensed and simplified forms of the services to which they were accustomed, and they received it with joy. So eager were the clergy and people for the new Book that copies were bought as fast as they could be printed; and wherever copies could be procured the reformed services were begun on Easter, 1549, although the Book was not authorized for use until Whitsunday.

* It must be remembered that English was not spoken universally by the upper classes for some centuries after the Conquest. In 1362 an Act of Parliament was passed, enjoining all schoolmasters to teach their scholars to translate into English instead of French. Interlinear translations of the Offices were often provided.

III.

The First English Prayer Book.—The Mass.

On the Vigil of Whitsunday, June 8, 1549, every priest in England celebrated Mass according to the Latin Rite. When he had finished the service the vestments were put away, and the church was prepared for the next day's festival. The next morning the new Book of Common Prayer went into use.

When the people went to church on Whitsunday at the appointed hour they found every article of furniture and every ornament in its usual place. They saw the crucifix and candles upon the altar and the pictures and statues where they had been accustomed to see them. Some changes had been made in the last few years, and had become somewhat familiar. No lights burned before shrines or pictures, and the litany desk stood in the place it had occupied for four or five years.*

Two candles burned upon the high altar to indicate the Presence of the Holy Sacrament.†

* Before the Reformation it was the custom to sing the litany in procession, a custom that had the authority of the use of a thousand years. In 1544 a Royal Injunction ordered the litany to be sung at a desk placed either in the choir or in the nave. The litany desk was an invention of the Reformers.

† In 1538 an Injunction had been issued by Henry VIII., directing the removal of all lights from the church except the

The people crossed themselves with holy water at the church door, genuflected to the Sacrament, and then knelt to say their prayers, as was their habit. Presently the priest entered wearing the familiar vestments, and accompanied as usual by acolytes. After he had said his private devotions at the foot of the altar steps, he began the Mass in an audible voice, and in the English language, censing the altar while the Introit was sung. There was nothing new to the people except the language, and even this was not entirely unfamiliar.* For some time they had heard the Epistle and Gospel in the

"light about the cross on the rood screen, and the two lights before the Sacrament of the Altar, etc." This order is commonly supposed to mean that two candles, and only two, are to be burned during the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist. Such, however, is not the case, for the Order was not dealing with ceremonial, but with the ornaments of the church building, having for its object the removal of all causes of superstition.

In the Latin version "coram" is the word which is the translation of "before," and coram means "in the presence of." The two lights were to be burned in the presence of the Sacrament. But in the Celebration there is no "Presence" until the prayer of consecration is said, and, therefore, had the Injunction meant that the two lights were to be used at the Celebration it would have been necessary to light them after the consecration. This would have been an extraordinary novelty and ritual innovation, without precedent. It is not uncommon in Italy at the present day to see two candles burning on the altar to indicate the Presence of the Sacrament, instead of the hanging lamp that is usual in this country.

In 1547 Edward VI. issued an Injunction directing the removal of all lights from the church, "but only two lights upon the altar before the Sacrament."

* As early as 1536 Archbishop Lee had ordered the clergy in the Province of Canterbury to read the Epistle and Gospel in English. This order was repeated in accordance with the King's (Henry VIII.) in 1542. There is evidence to show that the custom antedated 1530.

vernacular, as well as that part of the Mass called the Communion.*

The processional cross, the lights, the incense, the vestments, the ritual acts, the positions before the altar were the same; even the music was unchanged. The people were amply satisfied that there was no intention to break with the historical past of the Church, nor to change time honoured customs. They were in hearty sympathy with such changes as had been made; and it is this popular sympathy that explains the universal and joyful acceptance of the new Book.†

A few features of the service attracted the attention of the people, especially the position of the sermon. In the Latin Rite the sermon follows the

* "The Order of Communion," in the form of a canon of Convocation, was promulgated by the crown on March 8, 1548. It had been set forth in 1547 by the committee appointed by the King.

† Dr. John Hooper, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, was a bitter Protestant. Writing to Bullenger on Dec. 27 (seven months after the Prayer Book went into use), he says: "The public celebration of the Lord's Supper is very far from the order and institution of our Lord. Although it is administered in both kinds, yet in some places the Supper is celebrated three times a day. * * * They still retain their vestments, and the candles burn before the altars; in the churches they always chant the hours and other hymns relating to the Lord's Supper, but in our language. And that Popery may not be lost, the mass priests, although they are compelled to discontinue the use of the Latin language, yet most carefully observe the same tone and manner of chanting to which they were heretofore acquainted in the Papacy."

On February 16, 1550, John Butler wrote to Thomas Blaurer that some blemishes in the Church of England, "such, for instance, as the splendour of the vestments, have not been done away with."

Gospel, and after the sermon the Creed is sung. According to the new Book the sermon was made to follow the Creed. It is this change that explains the rubric, "after the Creed ended, shall follow the Sermon, etc." In our present Book the rubric reads, "Here shall follow the Sermon," an order which is sometimes interpreted as meaning that at every Celebration a sermon is to be preached. The meaning of the rubric is: if a sermon is to be preached it is to come in at this point of the service.

Another novelty was the incorporation of the "Order of Communion" into the body of the Mass, being inserted after the Agnus Dei. Since 1547 the people had been accustomed to have this as a special service for communicants only after the conclusion of the Mass, and its introduction here was a startling feature.

The Reformers made this change with deliberate intention to counteract the prevailing laxity in regard to communion. The Mediæval Church exaggerated the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Eucharist to such an extent that sacramental communion was practically neglected. Every adult in the land was confirmed, and everyone made his first communion, yet but few persons communicated except at Easter. The new order, requiring

three communions in the year, at the least trebled the standard of religious life.

Another rubric in the new Book bent its force in this direction. It was to the effect that during the offertory those who intended to communicate were to draw near to the choir, and "all others (that mind not to receive the said Holy Communion) were to withdraw out of the choir." It is quite likely that this order was given to shame those who habitually excommunicated themselves, for it made them publicly proclaim their neglect of the Sacrament. It was this custom, begun with a purpose, which doubtless suggested to the puritan Dr. Edmund Grindall, Archbishop of York (1570-1575), to order non-communicants to leave the church after the prayer for the Church.* The present widespread custom has not and never had any authority in the Prayer Book. The rubric of 1549 does not appear in any later Book, from which it is safe to infer that people soon became ashamed of neglecting to make their communions, a fact which they were obliged to advertise by withdrawing to the rear of the church. They could not leave the church, because a Royal Injunction forbade them to do so. The rubric was a temporary meas-

* Grindall was so bitter a partisan that he showed his hostility to the Church in very small ways. He objected to Fox's "Book of Martyrs" as being "too Catholic" (!) and suggested that a "file should be applied to it to reduce it."

ure, and, having accomplished its purpose, was allowed to drop out.*

The modern custom of the withdrawal of the people after the prayer for the Church Militant originated with an illegal order issued by a bishop for his own diocese. This custom is encouraged and maintained in these days without any authority, and in direct violation of the rubric after the prayer, which allows of no pause, but says, "Then shall the Priest say," etc.

The people also observed on that Whitsunday morning that especial prominence was given to the offertory by the introduction of a new feature, namely, the singing of Sentences of Scripture, or Antiphons, while the alms were being collected; the money, however, was not offered upon the altar. It was not until 1661 that this ceremonial was introduced into the service of the Church of England.†

* "If Omission is Prohibition" the case is rather bad for those who oppose what is called "non-communicating attendance at the Holy Eucharist," for the withdrawal of the rubric from the Prayer Book of 1552 and its absence from all subsequent editions, leaves in force the 24th Injunction of Edward VI. in 1547, which says: "In the time of the Litany, of the Mass, of the Sermon, and when the priest reads the Scriptures to the parishioners, no manner of persons without a just and urgent cause shall depart out of the church."

† The extraordinary prominence and fanciful ceremony seen in some churches at the present time in connection with the offertory is amusing to a student of liturgics. The money is collected while the people sit and listen to an anthem or a recital—generally by a tenor or a treble voice—and when this is finished the congregation rise while the vestrymen carry their alms basins to the priest. The priest very reverently

The Post-communion, or a sentence of Holy Scripture sung after the administration of the Sacrament, was a novelty, but was not regarded as of much importance. At the end of the Mass, instead of the customary "Ita Missa Est," the celebrant dismissed the congregation with what is to us the familiar Benediction beginning "The Peace of God."*

In all the ancient liturgies, as in the modern Greek and Latin Rites, there is a significant ceremony of giving the salutation of peace, known as the "Pax."† The resemblance of the initial words

receives the precious offering, and solemnly elevates it before placing upon the holy table, the vestrymen meanwhile standing before the altar, and the choir singing "All things come of Thee," etc. But when all this formality is over, and while the priest is placing the real oblation of bread and wine upon the altar the vestrymen are walking back to their seats, the choir have stopped singing, and the people, at a loss to know what to do, are partly standing, partly kneeling, and partly sitting. This extraordinary ceremony has been wittily called "the Elevation of the Cash."

* The Benediction is taken from the "Order of Communion," and is a dismissal from the altar, and not from the church.—Pullan's "History of the Prayer Book," p. 84.

The ablutions and private prayers of the priest were to follow the benediction. When these were ended the people were to depart.

† In the primitive liturgies the Pax or kiss of peace, was a kiss given by the celebrant on the cheek of the deacon, and by him given to the subdeacon, and so on through the clergy. It was then given to a man on one side of the church, and to a woman on the other side—the sexes being separated—and the salutation was thus passed from one to another through the whole congregation. The modern Roman Pax bears no resemblance to the ancient ceremony, and yet it is not without interest and historical significance. The manner of giving the kiss of peace is for the celebrant and deacon to lay their hands upon each other's arms above the elbow and incline their heads toward each other. The deacon and subdeacon exchange

of the new Benediction might suggest the transference of the "Pax" from its old place in the Mass and its incorporation with the new Blessing; but such was not the case, for in the Book of 1549 we find that after the consecration of the Elements the priest was to say the Lord's Prayer in the customary manner through the words "And lead us not into temptation," and then the people were directed to answer "But deliver us from evil. Amen." Then the priest said, "The peace of the Lord be always with you," to which the people responded, "And with thy spirit."

After the celebrant had given the Blessing he made the ablutions in the manner in which he had been trained, and having said the customary private prayers, left the altar as usual.

It will be noticed that there was nothing in the service to disturb the people. So far as they were concerned the Celebration had moved on progressively from point to point in the manner to which they were accustomed, and with the introduction of few novel features. The attention of the congregation had been attracted by a marked simplicity in some things, and by the use of the English

the same salutation, and then the subdeacon gives it to the priest in choir who is nearest the altar on one side, and then on the other, and they pass it to the next. This was the salutation of Roman citizens in ancient times when they met in foreign countries. Part of the old ceremonial was the murmuring of the word "Roma" and its anagram "Amor."

language throughout the Mass instead of only the Epistle and Gospel and the Order of Communion. There was a great reduction in the text of the priest's prayers, and the entire omission of his private devotions. These were not in the Book because they were not part of the "common prayer." Such Collects, Memorials and Responds as had always been in use were naturally retained, but being in the nature of private devotions for the clergy and servers were not printed in the book intended for public use. As these devotions had never been audible they did not in the least concern the congregation.

In the Book of 1549 the title of the Divine Service is

"THE SUPPER OF THE LORD.
AND
THE HOLY COMMUNION,
COMMONLY CALLED
THE MASS."

The order of the component parts of the service is as follows:

The Lord's Prayer. (By the Priest alone.)
The Collect "Almighty God."
The Introit. (An appointed psalm.)
The Kyrie.
iii., Lord have mercy upon us.
iii., Christ have mercy upon us.
iii., Lord have mercy upon us.
The Gloria in Excelsis.

V. The Lord be with you.
R. And with thy spirit.
The Collects.
The Epistle.
The Gospel.
The Creed.
The Sermon.
The Exhortation "Dearly beloved."
The Offertory.
The Sursum Corda.
The Sanctus and Benedictus qui Venit.
The Prayer for Christ's Church.
The Consecration and Oblation.
The Lord's Prayer.
The Pax.
The Exhortation "Ye who do truly."
The Confession.
The Absolution.
The Comfortable Words.
The Prayer of Access.
The Agnus Dei.
The Communion.
The Post-Communion.
The Thanksgiving.
The Benediction.
The Ablution.

When the people went to church in the afternoon they found a new service called Evensong. It was new, but not unfamiliar, for it was constructed of elements that were known. Only a few Sundays were required to enable them to learn Matins and Evensong, for there was nothing new in them but the arrangement of the parts, and even this arrangement was according to the recognized order or the old Choir Offices.

While there is no dispute as to the paramount

authority of the Book of 1549 during the reign of Edward VI., a question has been raised as to its agreement with canon law at that time and subsequently. The Prayer Book was put forth by consent of all sources of authority in the realm, the King, Parliament and Convocation. It was asserted that it was acceptable to all the clergy, and the assertion would appear to have been founded upon knowledge, since it is noticed that all persons were eager to use it. The Act by which Parliament authorized the book went so far as to say that it was inspired by the Holy Ghost, a claim that has never been made for any subsequent revision of the book.

The following quotations prove that the ancient canons are still in force in England and America, when not inconsistent with common and statute law.

By the Act 25, Henry VIII., c. 19, a Declaration of the clergy was recited, that many of the constitutions, ordinances and canons, provincial or synodical, were contrary to the laws and statutes of the realm, repugnant to the king's prerogative, and onerous to the subject; and the king was authorized to appoint thirty-two persons, half clergymen and half laymen, out of the two houses of parliament, "to view, search and examine the canons, constitutions, ordinances, provincial and synodal, theretofore made not contrarient or repugnant to the laws and customs of the realm and the prerogative royal."

It was also provided that "such canons, constitutions and ordinances already made, and not contrarient or repugnant as aforesaid, shall be used and executed as they were afore the making of the Act, till such time as they

shall be otherwise ordered by such thirty-two persons."— Murray Hoffman's "Treatise on the law of the P. E. Church in the U. S." (Introduction, pp. 43-44.)

"With regard to these canons it was, at the time of the Reformation, provided by statute 25 Henry VIII., c. 19, (afterwards repealed by 1 Philip and Mary, c. 8, but revived by 1 Elizabeth, c. 1) that they should be reviewed by the king and certain commissioners to be appointed under the Act, but that till such review should be made, all canons, constitutions, ordinances and synodals provincial, being then already made and not repugnant to the law of the land or the king's prerogative, should still be used and executed. No such review took place in Henry's time; but the project for the reformation of the canons was revived under Edward VI., and a new code of ecclesiastical law was drawn up under a commission appointed by the crown (stat. 3 and 4, Ed. VI., c. 11), and received the name of Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum. The confirmation of this was prevented by the premature death of the king, and although the project for a review of the old canons was revived in the reign of Elizabeth, it was speedily dropped, and has not since been revived.

"The result of this is, that so much of the English canons made previously to the statute of Henry VIII., as are not repugnant to the common or statute law, is still in force in this country (England)."— Penny Cyclopedia (Article on Canon Law), 1836.

IV.

The First English Prayer Book.— The Choir Offices.

It was the theory of the Mediæval Church that God's praise should be perpetually sung, and that the voice of worship should never cease. This great idea had come down from the ceaseless worship of psalmody instituted by David, and which had been continued for centuries in the Temple at Jerusalem. But the difficulties that lay in the way of a perfect expression of the idea were so great that at last the Church despaired of ever attaining it, and finally ceased to strive for it. The mistake lay in forgetfulness of the fact that the Temple was the only place in Judea where such worship was rendered, and that there was an immense body of musical Levites to offer it. If the effort of the Church had been directed to secure perpetual worship in one church in each diocese, say the cathedral, it might easily have been successful. But unfortunately the attempt was made to realize the idea in every parish church, and of course it failed. No single priest, nor any small body of clergy, could keep up a continuous service, and so the effort to have a perpetual worship was abandoned, and in its place a routine of frequent services was arranged. This was regarded as the best expression of the great idea that lay in the

power of accomplishment. We must therefore regard the Seven Hours of Prayer, not as the maximum of worship, together with the Mass, but as the minimum.

These Offices were contained in a book called the Breviary, and were arranged upon a plan that provided a service every three hours. Nocturns was said soon after midnight, Prime at dawn, Lauds at sunrise or thereabout, Tierce at nine o'clock, Sext at noon, Nones at three o'clock in the afternoon, Vespers at sunset, and Compline about bedtime.

It was only in the very strict monastic houses that this routine was carried out. In cathedrals, collegiate churches and college chapels the Offices were generally said by "accumulation," particularly the Morning Hours—Nocturns, Prime, Lauds and Tierce. These were grouped and somewhat condensed under the name of Matins, and said at one time. The order of daily services was not observed in parish churches, none of the Offices being said publicly except Vespers, and sometimes possibly Compline, on Sundays and other holy days. But everyone in Holy Orders was required to say all the Offices privately. The English clergy to this day are bound to say the daily services either publicly or privately. One can readily see that the reading of the "Hours," as

they were called, and the saying of a daily Mass would occupy a priest's whole time. The intervals between the Offices were so short that there would be no opportunity to do anything but recite services. Even study would be subject to constant interruption, and a conscientious man would find the system a heavy burden, and grievous to be borne. If a man were not conscientious he would take advantage of every occasion to omit his Offices, and in that way harden his moral sensitiveness. All sorts of subterfuges were resorted to, such as saying the night and early morning Hours by "anticipation," that is, before going to bed. The saying of these services took more time than we imagine, for they had become so elaborate and complicated that, in the language of the Preface to the Book of 1549, "there was more business to find out what should be read, than to read it when it was found out."

The Reformers cut at the root of the whole system, and gave up the ideal, that never was aught but an ideal, and never could be made a reality. By the abolition of the "Hours" they relieved the conscientious clergy of their heavy burden, and the unconscientious of a cause for hypocrisy.*

* Cranmer said, "It seems a mockery to retain the same division of the Hours observed by the ancient fathers when the custom of praying seven times a day has long ceased, and we now assemble only twice a day for prayers."

Their next step was to construct a new system of daily worship, and to order it to be said publicly in the church whenever it could be so done. On that famous Whitsunday in 1549 there was begun the order of daily Matins and Evensong, and for three and a half centuries it has been one of the glories of the English Church, and an immense blessing to the English nation. The moderation of a law that required two simple services daily, instead of seven or eight elaborate ones, has made it possible for the clergy, and for many of the laity, to say the Offices honestly. The rule of prayer satisfies religious souls, and yet is not so severe as to demand more than a clergyman can do.

The Choir Offices of the Book of Common Prayer created a new method of popular worship. The daily offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice was continued under the new order just as it had been under the old. The Reformers introduced only two measures of change in respect to the daily Mass, and these were to discourage a multiplication of Celebrations in the same church and on the same day; and to emphasize the communion aspect by requiring that there should be no Celebration unless there were communicants to receive with the priest. It was not intended to substitute Matins for Mass, but to add the Choir Offices to

the Eucharist. The restrictions that were placed upon Celebrations were put for a definite purpose, and were intended to incite the people to receive Holy Communion frequently. The great abuse of making the Easter Communion serve for the whole year had long prevailed. The Reformers were anxious to take this reproach from the Church of England, and in order to encompass their object they put certain rubrics in the Prayer Book.

One of these rubrics was evidently of a disciplinary character, and was intended to make the people ashamed of their neglect of the Sacrament. The priest was to vest and go to the altar on week days, and especially on Wednesdays and Fridays, and begin the Eucharist, but if there was none to communicate he was to stop at the Offertory, and after saying a Collect or two, was to dismiss the congregation with the Blessing. It was the intention of the bishops to shame the people and let them see that it was their fault if no Sacrifice was offered. The altar was prepared, the fasting priest was in his place wearing the sacred vestments, but if the people would not receive he was compelled to stop when he had said the preliminary part of the service. It is to be noted that this restrictive rule applied only to ordinary week days. On Sundays and other Holy Days the priest celebrated as a matter of course, whether there were

any to communicate or not. For although provision was to be made that at least one person should receive the Sacrament, yet if that person failed in his duty the Celebration proceeded. On ferial days the case was different, and a stringent rule decreed that "the priest on the week day shall forbear to celebrate the Communion, except he have some that will communicate with him." (This rubric was afterward rescinded.)

A careful study of the Prayer Book of 1549 gives one the impression that the authorities of the Church aimed at a reform of the Breviary rather than of the Missal. Indeed there was not much of the text of the Order of the Eucharist that could be changed, except the excision of some superfluous prayers of no great antiquity, and the Antiphons to the Introits. Some intricate and obscure ceremonies were abolished, and the Order of Communion was incorporated in the service; but beyond these modifications there was nothing changed that affected the laity.

The case with the Choir Offices was very different, for in their case the reform was really a revolution. The old order was set aside, and a new order established. The daily service ceased to be monastic, and became parochial; it was taken away from the exclusive use of the clergy, and given to clergy and people alike. This act of the Reformers

enunciated a new principle. It proclaimed the mutual and equal responsibility of clergy and people in the service of God. It introduced intellectual effort into worship, combined instruction with prayer and praise, and thus united man's whole being, body, soul and spirit, in the service of God.

The change of the Church language from Latin to vernacular English was, of course, a matter of great importance, but that alone would not have imparted to the worship of the English Church the character that makes it unique among all religious bodies. The English Church, with its American and Colonial descendants, has, since the sixteenth century, recognized the priesthood of the laity by giving to them so large a share of the daily Offices, that without the co-operation of the congregation the worship seems formal and incomplete. No other portion of the Catholic Church demands so much from the people, and none gets so much. A congregation in a Greek or Roman church listens and looks and prays individually; a Protestant congregation, of whatever name, sits and listens to the minister and the singers, but a congregation in an Anglican or American church takes an intelligent and audible part in every act of worship, whether it be of Eucharist or Choir Office, and whether the service be read or sung. This popular participation in public worship has created a new

standard of devotion and the practical efficiency and spiritual quality of all forms of Christian services are being tested by it. This standard is recognized as that by which others are to be judged, and the Roman ecclesiastic or Protestant minister who wishes to meet popular approval, finds that as much as possible of the service must be given into the mouths of the people, in their own language. The liberal and progressive Roman clergyman gives his people hymns, and the Rosary, and the Litany of the Saints in the vernacular, and the Protestant minister introduces into his form of service certain elements from the Prayer Book, such as the Lord's Prayer, the Te Deum, the Creed and the responsive reading of a Psalm.

The Book of Common Prayer furnishes the norm for intelligent worship at the present day, and is likely to do so for an indefinite length of the time to come. The merit of the Book is admitted in its exquisite diction, its loftiness of devotional thought, its broad scope and inclusiveness, and its intellectual standard. The Book has some faults, such as the present unfortunate arrangement of the parts of the Liturgy, and the omission from the text of some things that belong there, but there can be no dispute as to its merits, and these are so great that they would offset a great many more defects than the severest critic has yet found.

V.

The Prayer Book of 1552.

The Prayer Book of 1549 was followed by another in 1552, which was distinctly protestant in character, and was, in many points, contradictory to the former. The second Book was not issued to supply any demand made by either clergy or laity, nor in conformity with their wishes, but was put forth in direct opposition to the expressed opinions of clergy and laity alike. It "owed its existence," says Canon MacColl*, "not to any change of opinion on the part of the English Church, but to the accidental influence then exercised on English legislation by 'a revolutionary and aggressive party'; a party which, besides being 'revolutionary and aggressive,' was alien to the English Church in language, nationality, doctrine, sympathies, and respect for law." The leaders of this party were Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer and John a Lasco, foreign refugees, under the protection of the Duke of Somerset, who gave them places of dignity in the universities. Associated with them were a number of clergymen who had fled from England when Henry VIII. had issued his act in 1539, "for abolishing of diversity of opinions in certain articles concerning religion." This act, which was

* Lawlessness, Sacerdotalism and Ritualism, p. 24.

called "The scourge with six cords," was a savage law that decreed death by burning for holding any view of the Eucharist but the grossest transubstantiation, and pronounced felony as the punishment for offences against the other five articles. Those who fled from England went to Switzerland, where they fell under the influence of Calvin and Zwinglius, and were thus led into errors and heresy. Upon the repudiation of the Papacy they returned to England and posed as confessors returned from exile. Calvin co-operated with the foreigners and returned exiles in influencing the boy King Edward. His head was turned by artful flatteries. Strype* says that he was persuaded to regard himself as a second good Josiah, whose name would be blessed by future generations as a great Reformer.

The King's revolutionary proposals for a new book were opposed by the bishops, and he therefore exercised his royal prerogative. There is no record that the second Book was ever submitted to Convocation. Cardwell supposes that Convocation was induced to relinquish its authority to a Commission, but there is no record of such act. The book was prepared by a committee appointed by the King, and was sanctioned by Parliament on April 6, 1552. Pullan says unequivocally that

* Memorials of Cranmer.

"the second Prayer Book received no sanction on the part of the Church of England. Its publication was a gross breach of faith, as the Council had falsely declared in a previous statute of Parliament that it was an explanation and perfection of the former 'Order of Common Service.'"* The Book was to go into use on the following All Saints' Day, but the copies that were printed were so full of errors that an order in council, issued on September 27th, condemned them, and forbade the issue of any more. There is no evidence that any copies were printed after that date, and consequently when the 1st of November came there were no books to use. Hence the Book of 1549 continued in use.† The King was slowly dying, and he took no further steps in the matter, and the peers and bishops, the officers of the crown, and all in high positions or in authority were gravely serious about the succession to the throne. Even had the King persevered they would have found cause for delay, for no one could predict what would follow his death. In fact, a civil war seemed impending. Edward died on July 6th,

* Hist. of Bk. of Com. Prayer, p. 109.

† The Venetian ambassador at the court of Elizabeth reported that on Easter Day, March 26, 1559, "Mass was sung in English in the Queen's chapel according to Edward's Prayer Book with vestments." He further says that on S. George's Day, April 23, the Queen sent to the tower for the magnificent processional crosses in order that they might be used in her private chapel.—Kalendar of State Papers, 1558-1580.

1553, and with the accession of his sister Mary the Book of 1552 died also.

The second Book never had legal authority, was never used outside of London, and even there was used illegally, and it did not in any sense represent the doctrine, practices or wishes of the Church of England. It is of historical interest, but of no authoritative value whatever.

Strangely enough the Puritan party has always referred back to that Book as though it were the mature and deliberate work of the Reformers, and fully expressed the mind of the Church. The persistency with which this claim has been made by writers has caused a general opinion to prevail that their view was the correct one, but careful historical research has clearly shown that the view is without foundation. Not only do facts overturn it, but, as will be shown in later pages, the whole course of subsequent events completely disproves it.

The first Book was, unquestionably, the deliberate and honest work of the Reformers, done in faith and with sincere religious convictions, and met the approval of the whole realm. The Act of Parliament that legalized it says, "by the aid of the Holy Ghost it was with our uniform agreement concluded," and that it was "agreeable to the word of God and the Primitive Church, very comfort-

able to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation, and most agreeable to the state of this Realm." Cranmer said*, "the manner of the Holy Communion which is now set forth is agreeable with the institution of Christ, with S. Paul, and the old primitive Apostolic Church, and with the right faith of the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross."

It would not be of much interest to the general reader to give a complete list of all the innovations of the Book of 1552, but it is important to mention some of the chief changes.

1. The Sentences, Confession and Absolution were prefixed to Matins.†

2. The direction for intoning was withdrawn.

3. The rubric requiring Benedicite to be used in Lent was omitted.

4. Jubilate, Cantate and Deus were inserted as substitutes for the Gospel Canticles.

5. The Litany was ordered to be said on Sundays.

6. Exorcism, the use of chrism, the trine im-

* Defense of the Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament.

† In 1662 they were extended to Evensong. The suggestion of these additions to the service seems to have been taken from an order of service written in Latin in 1551 by Pullan, a Frenchman, who had been pastor of the Church of the Strangers in Strasburg, where he succeeded Calvin. (Proctor's History of the Prayer Book.)

mersion and the sign of the cross were omitted from Holy Baptism.

7. The sign of the cross was omitted from Confirmation.

8. The Unction of the Sick was withdrawn.

9. The Office for the Burial of the Dead was horribly mutilated. The commendation of the soul to God and all prayers for the dead were omitted, the 39th and 90th psalms were substituted for the 116th, 139th and 146th, the beautiful Versicles and Responses, and the Introit, Collect, Epistle and Gospel for the Holy Eucharist were expunged.

10. The name Mass was omitted from the general title of the Holy Communion.

11. The Decalogue and Responses were substituted for the ninefold Kyrie.*

12. The Eucharistic vestments were abolished, and only a surplice was allowed.

* This change was made at the suggestion of Dr. Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, who sympathized with the continental reformers. It was a return to one of the mediaeval corruptions of "farcing" or "stuffing" a canticle or response. The Kyrie, the Agnus and the Gloria in Excelsis had been treated in this way, and this was one of the abuses which the true Reformers corrected.

Even the introduction of the tenth response, "Lord have mercy upon us, and write all these Thy laws in our hearts, we beseech Thee," is a return to mediaevalism, as we find by a reference to the "farced" Kyries in the Sarum Missal. It is there ordered that on double feasts after nine expanded Kyries have been sung a tenth shall be added as follows:

"We beseech Thee forsake us not by reason of our offences; O Comforter of the sorrowing soul,
Have mercy upon us."

13. The word Altar was stricken out, and the altar was ordered to be placed "table-wise" in the body of the church.*

14. The priest was ordered to stand at the north side of the altar, instead of in front of it.

15. The Prayer of Oblation was displaced.

16. The Invocation of the Holy Ghost and the Benedictus and Agnus were omitted.

17. The manual acts of the priest were discontinued. (If the priest does not perform these acts there is no valid Sacrament, and hence, if the book had ever come into use the Sacrament of the Altar would have ceased in the Church of England as long as the book had been used.)

18. For the words "The Body, etc.," and "The Blood, etc.," in the administration there was a substitution of "Take, eat, etc.," and "Drink this, etc."

19. The Gloria in Excelsis was taken from its proper place between the Kyrie and the Collect for the day, and put at the very end of the service, and its use made obligatory at every Celebration.

20. The Pax was left out, and the Lord's Prayer changed from before to after communion.

21. Common bread was substituted for unleavened bread, and the mixture of water with the wine was omitted.

* See Note A at end of this volume.

22. Reservation of the Sacrament for the Sick was omitted.

This list might easily be greatly extended, but enough points have been cited to show that it was the deliberate intention of the framers of the Book of 1552 to destroy the catholic character of the English Church and to break with the past. God in His mercy saved the Church, for the Book was never accepted by the Church. While the Book never represented the mind of the Church, it yet became a basis for future revision on the accession of Elizabeth. That great queen was a shrewd woman, whose whole life had been so influenced by circumstances as to make policy a second nature with her. She was an adept at dissimulation, and capable of concealing her true views when placed in trying positions. When she came to the throne she was determined to have her people with her, and she felt her way cautiously. The real Tudor tyranny did not show until she was satisfied that her position was perfectly secure, and her most feared rival, Mary of Scotland, was in her power.

Elizabeth had not the slightest sympathy with the Protestants. While she was most cautious in expressing her real views she nevertheless let them be known when they were seriously questioned. She was a learned woman, and a good theologian,

and understood perfectly the questions at issue in the controversy of the times. She repudiated transubstantiation, and held the catholic doctrine of the Real Presence and the Sacrifice of the Eucharist. In her private chapel a crucifix and candles adorned the altar, and incense was used.

The royal chapel in ritual and ornaments was regarded as the model for the whole kingdom, and in several cathedrals the Mass and other services were rendered with great splendor.*

Upon her accession the Queen appointed a commission to revise the Prayer Book. The work done was hasty and imperfect, but the Book was authorized for use until a more thorough revision could be made.

Some of the most noticeable features of this book were the restoration of the vestments and ornaments in use in the second year of Edward VI., that is, before the publication of the Prayer Book of 1549. This rubric is still in force, and consequently whatever vestments or ornaments were used in church before the first Book was authorized, and after Jan. 28, 1548, are legally binding now.

Another feature was a compromise, restoring the words of Administration of the Communion from the Book of 1549 and combining them with those of 1552.

* Neal's "History of the Puritans."

A third feature was the omission of the declaration concerning kneeling when receiving the Sacrament. That declaration, known as "The Black Rubric," said that by the act of kneeling no adoration was intended to be done to the Presence of Christ. Logically, therefore, the omission of the rubric means that adoration is intended to be done.*

"With the Act of Uniformity, passed April 28, 1559 A.D., and the Injunction which followed, the Anglican Reformed worship, with the Ritual of Edward's early years, was in the main re-established."

Dr. Sandys (afterward Archbishop of York), one of the revision committee, wrote "The last Book of Service is gone through with a proviso to retain the ornaments which were used in the first and second year of King Edward VI. until it please the Queen to take other order for them."

One of the clauses of the act which made the Book legal stated that the sovereign, by the advice of the Commissioners or Metropolitans, might ordain "further Ceremonies or Rites." The recent "Opinion" of the Archbishops states that this law is still in force. Under it, therefore, Elizabeth's

* The quoted statement at the end of the Order of Holy Communion in the present English Prayer Book reads: "That no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood."

Every good Catholic will subscribe to that statement.

Latin Prayer Book is legal. This book was issued in 1660 at the request of the Universities, and in it Reservation of the Sacrament for the sick,* commemorations of the departed, and Celebrations of the Eucharist at burials are restored.†

One of the Royal Injunctions deals with music, and enjoins the use of the ancient Plainsong. A rigid enforcement of this law would exclude from the Church all other kinds of music, as this is the latest enactment upon the subject. It was Queen Elizabeth who introduced the custom of singing before and after service. In her time psalms were chanted, but later these were replaced by metrical versions of psalms. We have substituted metrical hymns for the old Sternhold and Hopkins doggerel, and we have added the meaningless and somewhat theatrical custom of singing them in procession.

* Quod si contigat eodem die Coenam Domini in ecclesia celebrari, tunc sacerdos in coena tantum Sacramenti servabit quantum sufficit aegroto, etc."

† "Celebratio coenae Domini in funibris si amici et vicini defuncti communicare velint, etc."

VI.

The Omitted Rubrics.

There are people of a rigid temperament who hold that in rendering the Offices of the Prayer Book, the most minute and absolute obedience is to be given to the rubrics, and that this principle of obedience excludes any act not commanded by rubrics.

Every loyal Churchman will agree that the rubrics are to be implicitly obeyed, because they were put in the book by lawful authority as positive directions, and not as suggestions. But the rubrics are not sufficient, either as commands or as guides. It would be impossible to say any service in the Prayer Book strictly according to rubrics. If the mind could be wholly divested of tradition and local usage, it would be involved at the outset in hopeless confusion. It has been pointed out that if the rubrics are to be literally followed, and if nothing is to be done but what is expressly commanded and provided for, the clergyman would never get into church; or if by some unfortunate accident he got there, he would never get out.

We are so much accustomed to traditional usage in public worship that we never read the rubrics, and never notice what they order, or what they omit and ignore. The fact is, that one can

only discover the meagreness of the rubrics by an imaginary attempt to conduct public worship solely according to literal directions. Let us take the first service in the book, as being the one most likely to have complete directions. The very first rubric says, "The Minister shall always begin the Morning Prayer by reading one or more of the following sentences."

This first rubric begins with the assumption that the Minister shall be in some appropriate and recognized place in the church, but there is not a hint that he is to arrive at that place by any particular mode of entrance, or whether he shall be habited in a vestment of any kind, nor what posture he shall adopt when he is in the place.

In the Prayer Book of 1549, the first rubric in Matins read, "The Priest being in the Choir, shall begin with a loud voice the Lord's Prayer, called the Pater Noster." But this rubric has been omitted, and if, as some contend, "omission means prohibition," then even this direction, insufficient as it is, cannot serve as a guide; and if the ruling concerning omission be accepted, then the priest may say the Office anywhere but in the choir.

The same Prayer Book directs that "In the saying or singing of Matins and Evensong, Baptizing and Burying, the Minister, in Parish Churches and Chapels annexed to the same, shall

use a surplice. * * * It is also seemly that Graduates, when they do preach, should use such Hoods as pertaineth to their several Degrees." For the celebration of "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called The Mass," it is ordered that the Celebrant "shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a white Albe plain, with a Vestment or Cope."*

And the Deacon and Subdeacon "shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for their ministry, that is to say, Albes with Tunicles." But these rubrics are also omitted, and there is not a word in our American Prayer Book about vestments. There is mention of a "rochet," and " the rest of the Episcopal habit" in the Ordinal, in the Form of consecrating a Bishop, but that vague mention gives no help. Even the Canons are silent upon the subject, the only reference in them being a restriction upon lay readers that

* By Vestment a chasuble is meant. It is often so called because it is pre-eminently the sacerdotal vestment.

Scudamore remarks, "In ecclesiastical usage 'the vestment' was more properly the whole of the prescribed dress of the celebrant, and it is so expressly defined in the Provincial Constitutions both of Canterbury and York—'That parishioners may be informed in every particular, let all men understand and observe that the chalice, the missal, the principal vestment of the Church itself, to wit, the chasuble, fair albe, amice, stole, maniple, girdle, etc., belong to the parishioners.' " The term was even understood to include all the vestments of the celebrant, deacon and subdeacon, chasuble, tunicles, cope, albs, etc., and even the altar hangings of the same color as the garments worn by the celebrant and his assistants—See Staley's "Ceremonial of the Church of England," pp. 156-157.

they shall not wear the dress "appropriate" to a clergyman.

Neither in the first English Prayer Book, nor in any subsequent revision or edition, do we get the most remote suggestion as to the posture of either minister or people in that portion of Matins that precedes the General Confession. In the Book of 1549 it was probable that the service was begun kneeling, since the first audible words were the Lord's Prayer, but it is by no means certain from the Book, for there is not a single direction as to posture until after the Benedictus, when all are commanded to kneel. The Sentences, Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution were added in 1552, without any direction, except that all were to kneel at the Confession, and the priest was to stand at the Absolution, and kneel again to say the Lord's Prayer. The inference from these directions is that the priest and people did not kneel at the beginning of the service. Did they stand? or did they sit? There is nothing in the Book to show what their posture was.

Again, all are directed to stand at the Gloria Patri after the Lord's Prayer. How long are they to remain standing? Anyone will promptly reply to that question, "until the Psalms are ended." But why sit down then? If standing be the rubrical position for the Venite and the Psalms, it is

also for the Lessons, because no change is indicated. Some persons lay it down as a rule of rubrical interpretation that "a posture that is directed is to be maintained until it is changed." If this rule be accepted, the question of the posture of the people will be greatly simplified, for in that case the congregation will stand at Matins and Evensong after the Lord's Prayer is said until the Creed is ended, and then they will kneel until the prayers are finished.

According to this system of strict rubrical obedience, without reference to tradition, all seats should be removed from churches, as being useless and inconvenient. Sitting is nowhere mentioned in the Prayer Book except in Confirmation, Ordination, and Consecration of a Church, when at certain points in these services the bishop is directed to sit in his chair. This brief, official act symbolizes the episcopal authority. The Greek, Russian, and other Oriental Churches never have pews, benches, chairs, or seats of any kind. The cathedrals of Europe have no fixed seats, except in the choir, and only a limited number of movable chairs in the nave for the people. There is no clear evidence to prove that there were fixed pews in parish churches in England prior to the fifteenth century, and it would be very easy to

make out a strong case to show that the reformers did not contemplate a seated congregation.* Strict obedience to rubrics requires the people to stand while the Lessons are read and the sermon is preached.

Next, consider the Litany. The title of the Office is, "The Litany, or General Supplication." The rubric following it reads: "To be used after Morning Service, on Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays." What is meant by Morning Service? Is it Matins? or is it Holy Communion? Must the Litany be said before the Eucharist, or may it be said after the Celebration? On page vii. of our Prayer Book we are told that Matins, Eucharist, and Litany are distinct services, and may be used either separately or together; and in the next sentence we are told that the Litany may be used in connection with either Morning or Evening Prayer. In the Ordering of Deacons and of Priests, the Litany immediately precedes the Eucharist. In the Consecration of a Bishop, it comes after the Nicene Creed, and before the examination of the bishop-elect. In no case is there any direction as to the posture for either clergy or people. The inference is that it is to be said kneeling, but it is only an inference. If we step

* Walcott considers that pews did not come into fashion until the fifteenth century.—Sacred Archaeology. Staley, p. 191.

outside the Prayer Book for information, the question can be settled at once by a reference to a Royal Injunction of Henry VIII. of 1544. It had been the custom to sing the Litany in procession, especially out of doors. On Rogation Days, for instance, the priest and all the people marched in procession around the bounds of the parish, singing the Litany. The tradition was at least as old as the time of S. Augustine of Canterbury. It was on a Rogation Day in 597 that he and his companions marched from Thanet to Canterbury to meet the heathen king, singing the Litany as they marched, and having a crucifix carried at the head of the procession. For what seemed to the Reformers good and sufficient reasons, they decided to abolish this ancient custom, and to order the Litany to be said or sung at a desk placed either in the choir or in the nave. When the Prayer Book was issued, nothing was said as to where or how the Litany was to be said, because to both clergy and people any direction would have been superfluous. The silence of the Book showed that the order to which they had been accustomed for five years was to prevail.

The Psalter is an important element of public worship. It enters into every service, and all the occasional Offices except Baptism, Confirmation,

and Holy Matrimony,* and it forms the back-bone of the Choir Offices. How are the Psalms to be said? The Prayer Book is silent. There is no hint as to whether the priest is to read them as he reads the Lessons, or whether the people are to read them with him, or by themselves, or antiphonally, or whether the choir are to sing them. Some clergymen announce the Psalms for the day, but there is no authority, either by rubric or by tradition, for the practice.† Sometimes one hears the announcement in this form, "The Psalter for the sixth day, Morning Prayer, beginning with the 30th psalm." This is not only extra-rubrical and extra-traditional, but also opposed to common sense. The Psalter is the Book of Psalms, not the portion appointed for an Office. And why say "Morning Prayer"? Do not the people know if it be morning or afternoon? And why say, "beginning with such or such a Psalm"? Are not the Psalms printed in the book according to the order in which they are to be used? Again, the Gloria Patri is generally read responsively. By what authority is it done? The Prayer Book gives no hint that it should be done so.

* In the English Prayer Book, there are psalms in the Office of Holy Matrimony.

† When the revision of 1892 was under way a proposition was made by the Commission to insert a form for announcing the psalms, but the Convention rejected it.—See "Book Annexed," p. x.

Tradition comes to our help. The Psalms are not to be announced, because every person has sufficient intelligence to know the day of the month, and the hour of the day, and there is no rubrical authority for making announcement. At the Reformation, and prior to it, the custom prevailed of singing the Psalms antiphonally, either between the priest and clerks, or between the cantors and the choir, or between the decani and cantoris sides of the choir. When no choir was present, the officiant sang antiphonally with the people. Reading was not introduced until a century after the Reformation. To a liturgical mind, it is just as sensible for a priest and congregation to read antiphonally the verses of a metrical hymn (say "The Church's One Foundation"), as to read a Psalm in this manner. The Gloria Patri, being a common ascription of praise, should be said by all.

A remarkable omission occurs in the Order of the Holy Communion at the point where the celebrant communicates. The rubric reads, "Then shall the Priest first receive the Holy Communion in both kinds himself, and proceed to deliver the same, etc." There are forms of words for the Priest to say when he administers the Body, and when he administers the Blood to the "Bishops, Priests and Deacons," and to "the People," but none when he communicates himself. Some

priests, not knowing what to say, use the forms given, addressing themselves in the second person, and some change the grammar to the first person, while others, comprehending that there is an omission, go back to the older Rite and say the form given in one or another of the ancient Uses. If we keep in mind that the Prayer Book is a Book of Common Prayer, and that the text is for audible recitation, the omission becomes clear. Every English priest who was in Orders in 1549 had been accustomed through his whole priestly life to use a prescribed form when communicating himself at every Mass he said, and in the absence of any new direction he understood that he was to continue his daily custom. A new Church would have presented a Prayer Book complete in every respect, and minute directions would have been put down for the celebrant. A continuous Church that merely reformed its external worship, without changing its character, would have done exactly what the Church of England did in 1549.*

* The form for the Communion of the celebrant in the Sarum Missal is as follows:

"To the Body let him say, before he receives, bowing down:

"Hail for evermore, most holy Flesh of Christ, to me before all and above all the highest source of joy. The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ be unto me a sinner the Way and the Life, in the Name + of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

"Here let him receive the Body, making a cross with the

The clergy of England in the sixteenth century did not need instruction as to the manner of offering public worship.* They knew how to celebrate the Eucharist and to recite the Offices. With few exceptions they were in sympathy with the movement, as is evident from the mention of isolated and sporadic instances of a few obstinate and recalcitrant priests who refused to use the new Book.

The Book of 1549 was put forth by the authority of an existing Church and was used by clergy and people who knew how to use it, and hence its rubrical directions are few and simple. This very meagreness of rubrics, and this constant reference to former customs and traditions, is a striking evidence of the continuity of the Anglican Church.

It is unnecessary to go into further detail, for the fact is that the Offices of the Prayer Book are

same before his mouth. Then to the Blood let him say, with great devotion:

"Hail for evermore, Heavenly Drink, to me before all and above all the highest source of joy. The Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be unto me a perpetual healing unto everlasting life. Amen. In the Name + of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

"Here let him receive the Blood; which taken, let the priest incline, and say with great devotion the prayer following:

"I give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God, Who hast refreshed me with the most sacred Body and Blood of Thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ; and I pray that this Sacrament of our salvation of which I, unworthy sinner, have partaken, turn not to judgment nor condemnation according to my deserts, but be profitable to the preservation of my body and soul unto everlasting life. Amen."

* Staley's "Ceremonial of the Church of England," p. 49.

practically unintelligible without traditional interpretation, and the omitted rubrics are more numerous and more important than those which have been inserted in the book.

Had the English Prayer Book been a new manner of worship, had the English Church been a new creation, had the English clergy presented themselves before the world with brand new Orders, the Book of 1549 would not have been unfinished and incomplete. But the exact contrary is the truth. The Book was not a novelty, even in its language, for parts of the services had been said in the vernacular for at least seven years. The Book was neither more nor less than a condensation and simplification of the existing service books. It was not the intention of the rulers of England, either spiritual or civil, to make any important changes in the worship, or doctrine, or discipline of the Church. All that they aimed at was the reform of abuses. Hence, the rule by which the Prayer Book is to be interpreted and by which it is to be used is, that where changes were made, they are indicated by rubrics, and where the rubric is omitted, the old custom is to be continued. To this rule there is an apparent exception, viz., that sometimes a rubric directs that to be done which it was the custom to do, as, for example, to kneel in prayer, or to stand when saying the Creed. But

this exception is only apparent, for sometimes prayer was offered standing, and in the use of the Rosary the Creed is always said kneeling. And be it noticed that many of these rubrics have been inserted in revisions of the Book subsequent to 1549, after Popish and Puritan practices has obscured the customs.

VII.

The Popular Attitude toward the Reformation.

Readers of English Church history have always been impressed by the popular acquiescence in the introduction of the Prayer Book, and in the Reformation movement in general. The attitude of the people was so unlike that taken by the people in similar movements in other countries at that period, and so different from those religious changes which occurred at later dates in England, that one is puzzled to explain it. There were no commotions, no insurrections or uprisings of the people, except in Cornwall and Devonshire, and not many protests nor even remonstrances from the clergy.* The change was made quietly and peaceably, and apparently with

* The outbreak in Cornwall was a protest against the book because it was in English, and that language was as unintelligible to the Cornishman as Latin was. The rebellion in Devonshire was not due to aversion on the part of the people to the reformed Service, but to the fanaticism of a few individuals who urged them on. There was "an infatuated conviction that in some way the Revisionists were associated with the abolition of the Common Lands. Many of the nobility to whom Abbey estates had been granted attempted to turn them to the best account, and made no scruples of enclosing commons, without respects to the rights of the poor to pasturage."—Studies in the History of the Prayer Book.—Canon Luckock.

"Some of the priests expressed an obstinate determination to resist the operation of the Act, and were content to suffer for conscience's sake. Others openly conformed to the obligation, but secretly continued to celebrate as of old. * * * The lords of the Council took violent measures to remedy the evil."—Ibid.

the consent of the whole nation. Various theories have been propounded in explanation, as for instance, that the nation was cowed by the unquestioned power of the king; that the people were too ignorant to know what was being done, and too sluggish to see consequences; that they were too indifferent to religion to care whether they belonged to the Catholic Church or not, or whether they worshipped according to a form that was Catholic, Romish, or Protestant. None of these theories is tenable in the presence of facts, and the popular acceptance of the Reformation must be accounted for on other grounds.

The first thing to be perceived is, that the patience of the English nation had broken down under the repeated disappointment of their hopes of reform. Probably every thinking man in England for at least three generations had recognized at their full value the corruptions that defiled the Church, and long before that period the authorities of the Church had made efforts for reform. As early as 1409, at the Council of Pisa, two English bishops, as a deputation from the national Church, had boldly asked for a reformation of ecclesiastical abuses, and the demand then made had been repeated again and again through the fifteenth century. These demands were met by studied silence, positive refusal, or promises that

were made only to be broken. At length King, Parliament and Bishops were tired of papal vacillations, temporizings, and bad faith, and convinced that appeals to recognized authority were in vain, they took matters into their own hands; and convinced by the urgency of the case and urged by the pressure of the people behind them, they proceeded to repudiate the illicit authority of the Pope and to make the needed reforms.* All the authorities appealed to a General Council, and were ready to abide by its decision; but the Pope would not call a Council, nor would he suffer any other power to summon one. The case was hopeless. Abuses had become intolerable, and if religion was to survive, the Church must be reformed and purified. The appeal to a Council was lodged and still stands, and if such Council should ever assemble it will be called upon to traverse the acts of the English Church from the early part of the sixteenth century, and pronounce judgment upon them. In the light of the history that has been

* "Both the Convocations of York and Canterbury threw off the jurisdiction of the pope by asserting that 'the bishop of Rome hath not by Scripture any greater authority in England than any other foreign bishop.' The words are carefully chosen, and they contain within themselves the whole principle of English protest against Rome. They do not deny that the pope has a primacy of honour among Christian bishops acquired by the consent of the Church; nor has the Church of England ever denied this primacy. They simply declare that no primacy was granted by Christ to S. Peter, and his supposed successors in the see of Rome."—Pullan's "History of the Prayer Book," p. 73.

made since that date, it is plain to see that the Council could not do otherwise than justify and commend the action of the whole Anglo-Catholic Church.

The repudiation of the papal claims by Henry VIII. was doubtless in accord with popular sentiment, for the Anglo-Saxon race has always resented and to this day resents, foreign interference in its affairs. It is true that the act of the King was as much political as it was ecclesiastical, and was also prompted by personal motives; but the result, apart from impulses, gave satisfaction to the nation. Henry did not mean to go much beyond the assertion of his royal prerogatives, for although he was not a Papist he was a Romanist and a Mediævalist and held "developed" doctrines, especially Transubstantiation, in their lowest and crudest conceptions. But having opened the door for reform he could not close it again, and the bishops and powerful nobles brought such pressure to bear upon him that he was compelled to take further steps.

The state of the monasteries demanded investigation and correction, and the King appointed a commission to proceed against them. Whether the King found matters worse than he expected, or whether he became conscious of his power by experimental and unresisted appropriation

of ecclesiastical property, we cannot know. At all events he proceeded to suppress the monasteries, and to rob them and the cathedrals of their revenues and their treasures. This aroused a strong feeling against the King, for the English always have been, and still are, a religious people. Religion is a dominant mark of their character. And they are a conservative people, strongly wedded to old customs. They continue to observe many customs whose origin and meaning have been lost in oblivion.* The people met the King's spoliation of churches and mon-

* The following letter appeared in The Living Church, under the date Feb. 10, 1900, and bears testimony to what is said above:

"I have been much interested in the 'Studies in the Prayer Book,' especially the third one showing how quietly the change was made and with what wisdom, when England's national Church asserted her right to regulate her own worship, without foreign intervention. A little incident with which I am acquainted will show how undisturbed the people were left in faith and practice, and how long ancient customs lingered.

"In 1836, my uncle, the Rev. G. Pakenham Despard, afterwards for many years a missionary to Tierra del Fuego, took his first charge as priest of the little village of Farnham, in the south of England, not far from Stonehenge.

"At that time there hung in the old church a large picture of our Lord. I think, but am not sure, that it was the Crucifixion. It was dim with age, dark with damp, and would have been pronounced by modern art 'a mere daub.' But every Sunday, when the villagers came, as their forefathers for generations had done, to their village church, they also did as their forefathers for generations had done. Stopping before the picture, every man bowed. The boys pulled their forelocks, the women and girls curtsied low, and then passed on to their seats.

"So gently, so patiently, were the necessary changes made by our Mother Church, that the simple faith and reverent customs of poor people like these had been left unquestioned and unshocked, to merge into fuller light.

"E. Murray."

asteries with obstinate opposition, and it became necessary to send armed forces to execute his commands. There was a strong feeling among the people as to the value of the "religious" life, and there was probably hardly a family that did not number a member of its own in some community.

On the other hand, the abuses of the monastic life were many and were well known. No doubt Henry took care that in the official reports these abuses should be magnified; but that fact, if it be a fact, does not disprove the charge that there were abuses. Some writers try to show that Henry's cupidity led him into his course of spoliation, but it is more likely true, and more just to him, to believe that in the beginning, after action had been forced upon him, he was influenced by two motives; the purification of the "religious" life, and a more equitable basis of taxation. Afterward he robbed because he had the power to take, and the treasures unearthed by Thomas Cromwell fed his avarice.

In the centuries preceding the Reformation the Church in England had absorbed lands and houses by purchase, gifts and bequests, as in other countries; and as this property was exempt from taxation the burden of maintaining the State fell heavily upon the lay people. When the French Revolution drove out the Bourbon dynasty, it was

found that the Church owned nearly half the land in France. When Victor Emmanuel consolidated his kingdom, it was discovered that so much of the real estate of Italy was exempt from taxation, because it belonged to the Church, that suppression of "religious" houses and confiscation of property by the government became necessary in order to save the State.

These facts must be considered in order to form a just opinion of the English Reformation. The opposition of the people to the exercise of the royal power in suppressing monasteries and robbing churches, brings out very distinctly the quiet temper with which the Prayer Book and the strictly ecclesiastical reforms were received. We can only account for the facts by understanding that the sympathies of the people were with the King in the reform of abuses, and against him in acts of tyranny and injustice. Henry's subjects were not the tame, cowed, indifferent and dull people they have been represented to be. There was a wider education and intelligence among them than among any people of Europe, except the Italians, and the English were second to no people in the sturdy assertion of their rights. And among their rights they claimed freedom of religious opinions. Henry knew that well enough, and every one of his successors discovered it sooner or later. Even

the obstinate and bigoted Mary had to reckon with that intelligence and that spirit, and Elizabeth, trained in adversity, but with wide open eyes, would never move unless she had her people with her. James I. tried conciliation, Charles I. tried coercion and James II. tried treachery; the first died in his bed, the second was beheaded, and the third was banished.

In dealing with popular movements we must keep in mind the fact that people are strongly influenced by externals, and that matters which a broad mind may deem insignificant are powerful factors in creating opinions and determining action with the majority of people. This is especially true in affairs of religion. It is reported of an old woman that she was not satisfied with an absolution given her, because the priest in pronouncing it had not worn a stole, and she was not content until she had prevailed upon him to put on a stole and repeat the absolution. The story may be fictitious, but it illustrates the point. There are many people still living who remember the bitter controversy over the substitution of the surplice for a black gown in the pulpit, and the present writer well remembers the disquiet caused to a good soul by the introduction into a church of a book-mark in the Bible with a cross on it. She said that since that cross had been in the church, she could not

say her prayers with the same comfort that she had experienced before. The present writer could quote many instances of the effect of externals in public worship. He knows of an entire congregation that was scandalized by flowers on Easter Day, and the worship was not allowed to proceed until the flowers had been removed; of a man who was forced to leave a church where he was a visitor because there were lighted candles on the altar; of a woman who declared that she would not feel that she was legally married if the priest did not wear a surplice; of a person who could not communicate because the celebrant wore a chasuble, and so on. People care more for the ceremonial forms than they do for the substance they express. They will create a commotion about the introduction of a novelty in ornament, vestment, or ceremonial, or the omission of something to which they are accustomed, and pass over in silence the promulgation of strong doctrine, or strong heresy, from the pulpit. This phenomenon is not confined to people of meagre education or low intelligence. A person of education and refinement has been known to acknowledge great mental disquietude because a priest wore a colored silk chasuble instead of a plain white linen one. Parochial dissensions have arisen over the introduction or removal of a litany desk. Things which can be seen are more weighty

in most people's minds than things which are heard. The present writer was once at a quasi-collegiate service in a church of pronounced "Evangelical" character. The Gloria Patri after each psalm and canticle was sung in Latin, to give an academic flavor to the service, and no voice was raised in protest. Had the officiant worn a colored stole, or turned eastward at the Gloria, there would have been a clamor of tongues.

The people of any race are essentially the same in every age, and the English of the sixteenth century can be identified, point by point, with their descendants of the nineteenth century. The men who invaded Durham cathedral in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, tore up the English Prayer Book, and sang Mass in Latin,* were the progenitors of the men who created the "surplice riots" and who are now making brutal efforts to abolish catholic rites in the reign of King Edward VII.

We find then, that the early Reformation was accomplished in England, and the purified worship according to the Book of 1549 was introduced in peace and quiet, with the practical consent of the whole nation. How was it done? The answer

* Bishop Creighton says that this riot had a political object, and that religion was only a pretext. It was headed by the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland in the interests of Mary Queen of Scots, and arose from the question of the succession to the English crown. ("Queen Elizabeth," p. 119.) The modern opposition to the restoration of catholic usages in England is also largely political.

is not hard to find. Apart from documentary evidence, such as the Prayer Book itself, Royal Injunctions, Canons, and Acts of Parliament, the operation of the popular mind and the law which governs popular action furnish the explanation. The people were satisfied with the change, because the externals of religion were not interfered with. Had the churches been stripped of their crucifixes and candles, their altars and pictures; had the familiar vestments and incense been taken away; had the accustomed ceremonial been removed; had the people been deprived of Unction and Confession and Requiem Celebrations, there would have been a different history written of the English Reformation. It was only years afterward that we hear of riots and insurrections, and only then in connection with efforts made to deprive the people of their cherished institutions, and to protestantize them.*

The only reasonable theory that will account for the gradual acceptance of the reformed worship is that the externals were unchanged. It is claimed that the joy of the people in having the service in the vernacular was more than a compen-

* The same thing is transpiring in France to-day. The bishops and the religious Orders are opposing the "Religious Societies Act" of the Government, but the parish clergy and the people care nothing about the matter. As long as the services in parish churches and the administration of the Sacraments are not interfered with, the people remain indifferent.

sation for the loss of crosses, copes and incense. The change from Latin to English was undoubtedly a matter of cordial thankfulness to those who spoke English, but it was no gain to those who did not speak it. The introduction of the English Prayer Book into Cornwall caused a bloody uprising, for the people knew no more of English than they did of Latin. The same ignorance of the language existed to a greater or less extent in every county. In fact, the common people of the early sixteenth century knew as much Latin as English, their vehicle of communication being the local dialects.

The people of England were sincerely attached to the Church of their forefathers, and to the sacraments, rites and ceremonies that were hallowed by the usage of centuries. These external matters were of far more importance to them than were questions of orthodoxy or heterodoxy. It is the same in every age. The modern layman of the Roman Church knows little, and cares less, about Papal Infallibility. The average Englishman cared little about the distinction between Transubstantiation, Consubstantiation, and the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist; but he cared a great deal how the Holy Sacrament was celebrated. We have an evidence of this statement in the undisputed fact that Papalists and Catholics worshipped

together through the reign of Edward VI., Mary I., and to the eleventh year of Elizabeth. The adherents of the Pope then separated, not because they were dissatisfied with the worship or sacraments of the Church of England, but in obedience to a papal command.

The disturbing elements in the English Reformation were the political claims of the Papacy, and the protestant spirit imported from the Continent, especially from Germany and Switzerland. Had England been let alone, the Reformation would have been wrought on the lines laid out by Wolsey and Erasmus, both wise and far-seeing. The doctrinal controversies that tore England with dissensions came in the next century, and revived the dialectic disputes of the Arian period. It was then that freedom of religious opinion was disputed; it was then that royal and ecclesiastical authority tried to coerce the people, and fanaticism resisted. It was the Puritan who attacked the Church and took up arms against the King.

VIII.

The Causes of Heresy in the Sixteenth Century.

The Reformation was the product of the corruptions of the Mediæval Church in more than one respect. It was not only the revolt from pernicious practices, but also from erroneous and mischievous teaching. It seems strange that a system that placed so much stress upon catholic unity and polity should have produced another system opposed to the first in every cardinal point; and yet such was the fact. This result was not due to the law of repulsion—that the pendulum swings as far one way as it does another—but it followed from the disproportion with which the Faith had been taught. As the neglect of Communion resulted from the exaggerated and one-sided teaching in regard to the Sacrifice of the Mass; as mere presence at the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist was allowed as a sufficient substitute for actual Communion; as enforced confession caused neglect of confession; as the exercise of the dispensing power in the episcopate opened the way for the coarse papal indulgences that commuted crime and insured immunity from suffering the penalty of sin after death; as the wholesome doctrine of praying for the departed was converted

into the sordid practice of selling Masses for the deliverance of souls from purgatory—so the erroneous theology that grew out of the disproportionate study of S. Augustine and S. Thomas Aquinas brought Calvinism and Lutheranism into existence and made them potent forces. The Mediæval theologians tried to measure the Faith by the dimensions of the philosophy of Aristotle; they magnified S. Augustine's questionable teaching on Predestination, and S. Thomas' on the Eucharist, until Calvinism and Transubstantiation were the logical and inevitable consequences. Luther's doctrine of Consubstantiation could with difficulty be distinguished by the common mind from the current Roman doctrine, except to see that it was less logical. It was a compromise between the Roman theologians and Zwinglius, and, like all compromises, was unfortunate. It confused minds, instead of clearing them.

In the same manner, the practical polity of the Mediæval Church produced Presbyterianism. At first sight it seems incomprehensible how men like Luther, Calvin, Zwinglius, and Knox, who had been brought up in the Catholic Church, and who had all been trained in theology, could have rejected the threefold ministry, and adopted a ministry consisting of a single Order. But a glance at the

practical working of the Church will explain the paradox.

In the middle ages, there were practically but two Orders of ministers in the Church—the pope and the priests. Deacons were secluded in monasteries and theological schools, and were never seen by the people. As they had no visible functions, they dropped out of popular sight, and even to the clerical mind they were but a grade in the minor Orders. It was even taught that diaconal Orders were not indelible.

The bishops were looked upon as vicars of the pope, and the common opinion was held that a bishop was but an elevated priest, holding power and authority from the pope. Bishops were not often seen by the people, and when they were seen, they were looked upon as mere papal representatives. But priests were everywhere—in the churches, on the streets and roads, in people's houses. At every turn in a man's daily occupation, a priest was at his elbow. The priest was a constant factor in every man's life, from the cradle to the grave, and he was so associated with every event, spiritual and temporal, that he became indispensable. The pope, too, was ever present. His claims to power, spiritual and temporal, hung like an overshadowing cloud, over the Church and over the king. Though never seen, he was never forgot-

ten; and the very mystery of his hidden presence was potential in its influence upon the popular mind.*

The virtual abolition of the diaconate, the degradation of the episcopate, and the omnipresence of the priesthood and the pope, prepared a place in men's minds for a theory of a ministry of two Orders. And when the Papacy was rejected as unscriptural, uncatholic and unhistorical, there remained but one Order—the priesthood. This Order was shorn of its sacrificial function when the Reformers rejected the miracle of transubstantiation, and only the pastoral and preaching powers remained. The men who had been trained in a defective theological system failed to see that a true priesthood exists to offer sacrifice, not to work miracles; and that the catholic doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist requires a priesthood, which the alleged miracle of transub-

* Modern Roman ecclesiastics seem to be as far astray as those of the Middle Ages in regard to the threefold Ministry. Cardinal Martinelli, Papal Delegate to the United States, in a recent article in Harper's Bazar, says: "This Papal mandate (Gregory VII.) renders the marriage of a priest, deacon, or subdeacon, duly ordained, not only unlawful, but null and void according to the Church, and in Catholic countries null and void according to the law of the land. The marriage of a priest, deacon, or subdeacon is regarded precisely in the same light as the marriage of a divorced person whose husband or wife is living. * * * Those who receive the major Holy Orders, place it beyond their power to contract matrimony." Cardinal Martinelli classes subdeacon, deacon and priest as the three Holy Orders. Evidently with him a bishop is but an elevated priest.

stantiation does not require. As they knew little of Greek, they failed to see hiereus written under presbuteros,* and as they had not been taught to distinguish between apostolos and episkopos, they concluded that presbyter, minister, and elder, covered the whole ministry, and described all the functions of its one Order.

Such erroneous teaching undermined the Church, and when men cast off the enormous weight of the Papacy, the whole structure fell to the ground. The Church lay in ruins from the Alps to the Baltic Sea, and sects took its place in Switzerland, the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Scotland, in portions of France and Poland, and in nearly the whole of what constitutes the German Empire outside of Bavaria.

By God's mercy England was saved, though there was a time when the Church in that kingdom was threatened. The revolutionary ideas of the continent found a lodgment, and for a time it looked as though Catholic England would become Protestant and Sectarian England. But the crisis that seemed impending soon passed and the Church was saved. Edward VI. died, Mary I. turned back the tide, and when the recoil wave came, Elizabeth

* Romans xv., 16. *εἰς τὸ εἶναί με λειτουργὸν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ.* The Vulgate is misleading, translating leitourgon, "Minister," and hierourgounta, "sanctificans."

and her wise and conservative advisers were in power, and the danger was over.

Still, the continental ideas were in men's minds and from those ideas grew the Calvinistic party in the Church and the Puritan party outside it. Those ideas have produced the varying sects that exist in England to-day, and the still greater number that flourish on the congenial soil of America.

When the danger of 1552 had passed, when the attempt of Philip and Mary to restore the Papacy had failed, a reaction set in against Protestantism, and the bishops and other ecclesiastical authorities began to restore to the Church the external marks of Catholicism.

IX.

The Catholic Reaction.

Queen Elizabeth ascended the throne on November 17, 1558. For a month the Latin services were continued.* On December 27 a proclamation was issued, forbidding preaching and commanding that the Epistle and Gospel, the Decalogue, the Litany, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer shall be said in English, but that no further changes shall be made until authorized "by her Majesty and her three estates of this realm." A commission was appointed to revise the Prayer Book. The Queen and Cecil both desired the adoption of the Book of 1549, but the Commission took the Book of 1552 as a basis, and reformed it in the direction of 1549. They made a number of changes in the catholic direction, and eliminated the objectionable protestant features.

Among the changes was the adoption of the

* When Elizabeth came to the throne, "there were serious questions to be faced, which needed settlement; and foremost among them was the question of religion. In nothing was the legacy of the last two reigns more disastrous, as they represented periods of reaction which had checked the natural development of the reforming process begun under Henry VIII. Henry had abolished the papal jurisdiction, and had suppressed the monasteries, which no longer fulfilled any useful function. The system and services of the Church were simplified according to the requirements of the New Learning and the increased intelligence of the people; and the process thus begun was to go on slowly adjusting the old system to the national capacity."—"Queen Elizabeth," by Mandell Creighton, Bishop of London. 1899.

famous "Ornaments Rubric." This rubric restored all the ornaments, utensils and vestments that were in use in the second year of King Edward VI., that is, before and at the time of the adoption of the First Prayer Book. It is very plain that copes, chasubles, censers, crosses, candles, pictures, etc., had continued in use through the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Mary I., and into the reign of Elizabeth, and by this rubric were to be continued as long as the rubric stood in the Prayer Book. It stands in the English Book to this day, and therefore these ornaments, utensils and vestments, are legally binding. Furthermore, no additional rubrics were inserted concerning ceremonial, and therefore the ceremonial that went with the ornaments in 1548 went with them in 1559, when the revised Book was authorized for use; and as no change has been made since then, the same ceremonial is now lawful.* †

The revised Book was very generally accepted, and one cannot but think that it was so accepted because the externals of worship were practically unchanged. As was said in a former chapter, "we

* "The ornaments ordered to be retained and to be in use are such as had the authority of the English Parliament at a certain specified time: * * * In 1662, when the present Ornaments Rubric was slightly altered and re-imposed, the Church took the initiative and the State confirmed its action. Our Ornaments Rubric thus possesses the full authority of Church and Realm, and is part of the statute law of England."—"Ceremonial of the English Church," p. 73, Vernon Staley.

† See Note B at the end of this Volume.

must keep in mind the fact that people are strongly influenced by externals, and that matters which a broad mind may deem insignificant are powerful factors in creating opinion and determining action with the majority of people." "A Royal Visitation was held in the Province of York, under a commission dated July 25th. It then appeared that the Prayer Book was so generally accepted by the clergy, that out of 9,400 only 189 refused to adopt it. This number included those bishops and others of the most extreme Romanist party, who had been appointed in Queen Mary's reign on account of what in modern times would be called their Ultramontane prejudices." †

No further change was made in the Prayer Book during the reign of Elizabeth, except that in 1561 alterations were made in the Kalendar and the table of Lessons. But although no changes were made in the authorized services of public worship, the Puritan party continued, with increasing rancour, to assail the Prayer Book, and when James I. became king in 1603, high hopes were entertained that the Book would be set aside, and a protestant form be adopted in its place. A petition was presented to the king which stated that "more than a thousand" of his subjects "were groaning as under a common burden of human rites and cere-

† Blunt's "Annotated Prayer Book."

monies." A hearing was granted, and resulted in the Hampton Court Conference (1604), but no change of any importance was made in the Book, except the addition to the Catechism of the part about the Sacraments—and that is distinctly catholic.

When Cromwell's death brought about the collapse of the rebellion and the provisional government "the king came to his own again." The restoration of the monarchy was also the restoration of the Prayer Book. Very strenuous efforts were made by the Puritans to have it either abrogated or revised, and Charles II. yielded so far as to authorize a Conference to be held for the consideration of objections. This is known as the Savoy Conference. It opened on April 15, 1661, and closed on July 24th of the same year. The Dissenters were so bitter and impracticable that nothing was accomplished. They rejected all the concessions that the bishops proposed for the sake of peace, and the Conference closed with the Prayer Book untouched. A Commission was then appointed to revise the Book. They proceeded vigorously, and presented their work to Parliament in so complete a form that it was adopted on March 17, 1662, and received the Royal assent on May 19th of the same year, after having been adopted by Convocation. This is the Prayer Book of the Church of England at the present day.

Among the Commissioners of 1661, Dr. John Cosin, Bishop of Durham, was the most learned liturgist, and the strongest catholic. He had been privately at work on the Prayer Book since 1619, and his notes and suggestions formed the basis of the revision. A great many changes were made by the Commission, but few that involved any doctrine. The doctrinal alterations were, however, all in a catholic direction. For example, the idea of priesthood was more strongly asserted; the word "priest" was frequently inserted in place of "minister"; the form of ordination was altered to the present uncompromising form, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God"; and likewise, "of a priest"; prayers for the dead were vindicated by the insertion in the Prayer for the Church Militant of the beautiful memorial beginning, "and we also bless Thy Holy name for all Thy servants departed this life," etc. "Oblation" was inserted after "alms"; greater reverence was shown to the consecrated Elements by fresh rubrical directions.

Other instances might be adduced, but these are sufficient to show that the Church restored, as far as possible, the catholic character of the text where it had been impaired by Puritanism; and that ceremonial remained untouched.

It should not for one moment be thought that

the actual ceremonial of the Church was unchanged from 1548. Indeed, there had been a sad falling off, not only in external reverence, but in doctrine and in the use of the Offices of the Prayer Book and the Sacraments. Infant baptism had been so widely neglected during the Cromwellian period, that a part of the new generation consisted of unbaptized people, and the "Office of the Baptism of persons of Riper Years" had to be put in the book. For at least eight centuries there had been no unbaptized adults in England. It is no wonder, then, that people who had strayed so far from the truth of the Gospel as to neglect the baptism of their children should have been weaned from the solemnities of worship and the glory of holiness.

A Church is not to be judged by the practice of the people at any isolated epoch, but by its authoritative formularies, and by its teaching and acts through various periods. The convulsions of the early part of the seventeenth century were sufficient to uproot almost any traditions. And yet the catholic traditions of the Church of England were not rooted out. The coronation of Charles II. revived the ancient splendor of the Church, and the magnificence of the ceremonial outshone all functions that had ever taken place in Westminster Abbey. This set the keynote for the Church, and the adoption of the

Prayer Book of 1662 showed that the Church responded to the note.

One would fain ignore and forget the dreary decadence of the eighteenth century, the hundred years that are so conspicuous for their hideous corruption of morals and manners, politics and religion; and yet, through all that period of degeneration, the "High Church party," with catholic instincts, survived in the English Church. The Lord reserved the "seven thousand men who had not bowed the knee to Baal," and the remnant that were true to God and His Church kept the flame of faith and tradition alive upon the altar. The lineage is clear, from Andrewes, Laud, Beveridge, and Pearson, through South, Butler, and Wilson, to Jebb, Coleridge, Philpotts, and Pusey.

The Tractarian Movement began in 1833, and was at first largely occupied with the revival of doctrine, and with setting forth the claims of the Church of England as a part of the Catholic Church. The movement in its early stage was academic, and addressed itself to the educated class. But before long the Prayer Book was taken in hand and men were told to read it with intelligence. The Book was in daily use, but formalism and familiarity had robbed it of meaning. To most people it was the hereditary formulary of the Established Church, without a history and without a parentage

that antedated the Reformation. The eighteenth century had lost the key to its interpretation. When the Tractarians handed back the key which they had recovered, people began to see new and undreamed of meanings in the Book, and as knowledge increased, they began to use it with a new sense. The valley was full of dry bones, but the Spirit of God breathed upon them, and they became again living forms.

As soon as the clergy understood that they were ministers of the Apostolic Church, they began to restore the catholic character to Sacraments and worship, and from 1840, or thereabouts, the restoration has been rapid and thorough. Not one word of the Prayer Book was altered, and no new rubrics were added, but the forms were clothed with a new raiment. One tradition after another was revived. "The King's daughter is all glorious within; her clothing is of wrought gold." The Holy Eucharist has been restored to its place as the chief act of worship; celebrations have been multiplied, and now there are comparatively few churches without at least a weekly Eucharist; stone altars and reredoses, crosses, crucifixes, pictures and statues, have been brought back to the churches; the lights gleam again upon the altar, and the fragrant clouds of incense are not unknown; the ancient vestments, with all the glory

of color, embroidery, and jewels, are worn again; the service is chorally sung by vested choirs of men and boys; acolytes serve at the altar; the sign of the cross is made; confessions are heard; fasting communions are made; the dead are remembered in prayer; the reserved Sacrament is taken to the sick; the daily Sacrifice is offered again; the pew-rents are vanishing, and free-will offerings are supporting the Church; the missionary spirit has become a prodigious influence; the Church is gathering the forsaken poor into the fold; the standard of Christian living has been raised; and principles are rapidly supplanting emotions and personal opinions. All this has been accomplished, be it repeated, without the change of a word in the Prayer Book! Surely we can say, "What hath God wrought!"

X.

The American Book of 1789.

When the American Church asked for the episcopal succession from the English Church, a demand was made by the English bishops for a copy of the proposed Prayer Book. This was sent, and was instantly rejected by the bishops, on the ground that it departed so far from the English Book as to bear but slight affinity to it. They contended that it contained insufficient statements of necessary doctrine, and questionable forms of belief, and did not balance the English Book in forms of worship. The Proposed Book was radical in a protestant direction, and would not have been accepted by the great mass of Church people; indeed, in the few churches where it was introduced it met with positive resistance on the part of the people. The changes from the English Book were numerous and mostly unnecessary. Some alterations were needed owing to the changed political condition, but no change from a monarchy to a republic required the substitution of "adorable" for "honourable" in the Te Deum. A good many verbal changes were made, some of which remain to the present day, but the old words might just as well have been left. But no excuse of political circumstances or growth of the language could condone

the omission of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, the limitation of the use of the Gloria Patri to the end of the Psalms for the day, the omission from the Apostles' Creed of the article "He descended into Hell," the abbreviation of the Versicles and Responses, the omission of the sign of the cross in Baptism, or the word "absolution" from the rubric, nor the express limitation of the Sacraments to "two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper," and so on.* This book was "proposed" in 1785, but was not adopted.

Dr. Samuel Seabury was consecrated Bishop of Connecticut in 1784, by Bishops of "the Catholic remainder of the Church in Scotland." † Drs. White and Provoost were consecrated for the Dioceses of Pennsylvania and New York, respectively, in 1787, in Lambeth Palace Chapel, after a Concordat had been signed by representatives of the English and American Churches. In 1789 a General Convention met in Christ Church, Philadelphia, when the Holy Eucharist was celebrated according to the Scottish adaptation of the Prayer Book of 1549, and "the adoption of our present Communion Office immediately followed the celebration." The revision of the Prayer Book was then pro-

* Genesis of the American Prayer Book, by Bishops Coxe, Seymour, Perry and Doane.

† This expression is used by the Scotch Bishops in the Concordat made with Bishop Seabury.

ceeded with, and it was adopted at this Convention, fully meeting the requirements of the Concordat. Bishop Seabury secured the adoption of the Oblation and Invocation in the Consecration of the Elements in the Holy Eucharist, from the Book of 1549, and as retained in the Scotch Book. But unfortunately, the prayer was not adopted as a whole. The portion omitted follows the sentence: "And we also bless Thy Holy Name for all Thy servants who, having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labours." The Scotch form goes on: "And we yield unto Thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all Thy Saints, who have been the choice vessels of Thy grace, and the lights of the world, in their several generations; most humbly beseeching Thee that we may have grace to follow the example of their steadfastness in Thy faith, and obedience to Thy holy commandments; that at the day of the general resurrection, we, and all they which are of the mystical body of Thy Son, may be set on His right hand, and hear that His most joyful voice, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.' Grant this," etc.

The American Church owes an immense debt to Bishop Seabury for his persistent influence in se-

curing the essential part of the Consecration Prayer.

The Prayer Book as adopted in 1789 remained unchanged until 1892, when, after a revision that had lasted twelve years, the Book was adopted in its present form.

In the Preface to the Book, the General Convention of 1789 stated "that this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship; or further than local circumstances require." This statement was accepted by the authorities of the English Church, and thus sealed the Concordat between the two Churches. It is a declaration that establishes perfect accord between them, and binds them both to make no changes in "essential points" without mutual consent. Therefore whatever differences exist must be regarded as required by "local circumstances." Moreover, the best canonists, and among them the late Rev. Dr. Haight of New York, hold that traditional usages, and even canons enacted before 1789, are binding upon the American Church, except in so far as they have been annulled by subsequent American legislation, or are acknowledged as obsolete by both Churches.

Under this interpretation, the Ornaments Rubric, and all that it carries, is binding upon the

American Church. This is a sound, logical and legal position, and must be insisted upon. Any other attitude toward the Church would involve us in hopeless confusion, because it would cut us off from the Church of antiquity, since we draw our descent and trace our lineage from the Apostolic Church, through the English Church. The apostolic succession and the text of the Prayer Book are not the only connecting links with the past, essential and indispensable as they are, since the unbroken life of the Church is also to be traced through the standards of the faith and their interpretation, through the manner of worship, and through the sacramental life of the people. Even discipline forms a strand in the rope of continuity. It needs but a hasty reading of the Prayer Book, and the American constitutions and canons, general and diocesan, to show that the commonest matters of discipline are scarcely touched upon by these documents. In all such matters we act upon usages that descend from the Primitive or the Mediæval Church, which are not mere traditions that may be observed or neglected, but which are formulated in canons that are centuries old. For instance, it is thought to be an unwritten law that a priest must not celebrate the Eucharist more than once a day, except in cases of necessity, or on Christmas Day or Easter Day. Yet it is not a

mere custom that regulates the practice, but a canon of the English Church, enacted in the fourteenth century.

The American revisionists, having settled the "essential points of doctrine, discipline, and worship," say that "they could not but, with gratitude to God, embrace the happy occasion which was offered to them * * * to take a further review of the Public Services, and to establish such other alterations and amendments therein as might be deemed expedient." Some of these "alterations and amendments" are to be deplored, such, for example, as the permissive use of the Nicene Creed in Matins and Evensong. This is the Creed of Communion, and should never be divorced from the Holy Eucharist. Its use in the daily Offices is without precedent, and is unliturgic.

It is an "alteration," but not a commendable "amendment" in the Prayer for all Conditions of Men, to change the phrase "we pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church," into "Thy holy Church universal." The loss to the American Church by that change has been, and is, very great. The English Church daily asserts her catholic position; the American Church loses herself in a vague universality. In the Te Deum too, we have "Thine adorable, true, and only Son," for

"Thine honorable," etc. "Adorable" is not a translation of "venerandum," though it is indeed nearer the thought of the Latin word. In the same great hymn, a spirit of prudery substituted "Thou didst humble Thyself to be born of a Virgin," for "Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb." Yet the latter is the true translation of the original Latin, "non horruisti Virginis uterum." Our form is a paraphrase, not a translation.

Even the Collect for Aid against Perils was changed into "O Lord, our heavenly Father, by whose Almighty power we have been preserved this day," etc., and the Collect stood in that shape until 1892, when it was restored to the old form, "Lighten our darkness," etc. Our forefathers were apparently afraid of light.

The Benedictus Dominus Deus was mutilated by cutting off all the verses after the fourth; the last verse of the Benedicite was taken away; the Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis were omitted altogether, and Psalms were substituted for them. Of the three great Hymns of the Incarnation, two were removed from the Book, and the third was so abbreviated that its historical and prophetic value was almost entirely destroyed.

Permission was given to omit the Gloria Patri after individual Psalms, the rubric only requiring it at the end of all the Psalms at a given service.

And a liturgical solecism was committed in permitting the Gloria in Excelsis to be substituted for the final Gloria Patri.

It is unnecessary to enumerate more of the changes, most of which were needless, and many of which have been undone by the revision of 1892, when the original forms were restored.

But if we deplore losses in the Book of 1789, we can also count gains. It is a distinct gain that a rubric permits the singing of a hymn after the conclusion of the Eucharistic Consecration, and another that allows the substitution of a hymn for the Gloria in Excelsis. Under this rubric, the angelic hymn can be omitted in penitential seasons, and an appropriate hymn or anthem can be said or sung in its place. It is a distinct gain that we have the Office of Institution, for in that service the word "Altar" is used several times, and Lord's Table or Holy Table not once. We owe this service to the Rev. Dr. William Smith, of Stepney Parish, Somerset County, Md., and afterwards of Connecticut, a brilliant and learned man, who had a prominent part in the work of revision.* It is quite evident that Dr. Smith was a Free Mason, by his use of the terms Senior Warden and

* There were two priests named William Smith, both prominent at this period, and both originally from Maryland. The Dr. Smith mentioned here was a much better churchman than the other of the same name. The other was celebrant at the General Convention in Christ Church, Philadelphia, in 1789, and had a considerable share in the framing of the "Proposed Book."

Junior Warden, in the Office of Institution, instead of the old name Churchwarden. It is a curious fact that the Masonic names have supplanted the Church names in common usage; and one wonders at this, for the Office of Institution is seldom used.

Despite the differences between the English and American Prayer Books, the doctrinal standards of the two Churches are identical, the forms of worship vary but slightly,* and the differences of discipline are only those which are necessitated by what our compilers called "local circumstances."

The Tractarian Movement began to be felt in this country about 1840, and the Catholic Restoration which had begun in England was taken up here. It has gone on as easily with the American Prayer Book as it has with the English. In fact, it made such strides, that in a dozen years awakened hearts and minds began to make efforts for improvements in the Church's methods of worship and work. Evidence was seen in every grade of churchmanship, of a larger grasp of catholicity, and a new sense of the mission of the Church to the American people.

* By the revision of 1892, the American Book was made to conform in many respects to the English, and the differences that still exist are so slight as to attract little attention, except in the Prayer of Consecration in the Holy Eucharist. In this matter the American Book is immeasurably above the English Book.

XI.

The Memorial Papers.

The Tractarian Movement was an elixir of regeneration to the American Church. The principles set forth awakened the slumbering clergy and people, and made them open their eyes to see what the Church is, and to see the responsibilities and opportunities which environed her. The torpor of the eighteenth century was shaken off, and a new life was felt pulsating within. At first the vision was dim, and men were seen "as trees walking"; but soon the power of seeing cleared, and the mission of Christ's Church to humanity was clearly recognized. The revival that passed from surprised thought to action in a dozen years was Pentecostal in zeal and fervor. Men began to ask, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" and then they tried to do what, in their wisdom, they thought ought to be done.

At first we find men of all schools and shades of opinion uniting in devising plans for the promotion of Christianity, with an enviable harmony and unity of purpose. The bitter differences of High and Low Churchmen did not begin until a decade later, and the acrimonious persecution of the "Ritualists" came still later. These later dissensions came from a struggle to close the door

upon the whole body of catholic doctrine, worship, and discipline. Many men who had responded to the first movement of the Spirit were unwilling to accept the entire deposit of the Faith, and when they saw what lay before them, they drew back, and "walked no more" with those who scrupled not to be thorough catholics.

Those early years of restored life saw a marvellous advance of the Church. It was an era of founding of new parishes, of restoring the weekly Eucharist and the Daily Offices, the establishment of the free church system, and a great movement for missionary extension. It is to that period that we trace the beginning of work among the poor, of more frequent services, of flexibility in the use of the Prayer Book, and of a determined effort to restore the beauty and grandeur of worship. In it we find the first advocacy of choral service, and a higher standard of ecclesiastical music. The academic gown began to be replaced by the surplice in the pulpit, and the chaplain's scarf was gradually exchanged for the stole.

It is necessary to review this page of our history, in order to understand the last revision of the Prayer Book, for many of the changes of 1892 only become intelligible through a knowledge of the opinions and events of the midde of the nineteenth century.

A book called The Memorial Papers* was published in 1857. It is now out of print, and is becoming a scarce volume. It was edited by Bishop Alonzo Potter, of Pennsylvania, and the introduction was also written by him. The book contains a Memorial to General Convention, signed by W. A. Muhlenberg, C. F. Cruse, Philip Berry, Edwin Harwood, G. T. Bedell, Henry Gregory, Alex. H. Vinton, M. A. DeWolfe Howe, S. H. Turner, S. R. Johnson, F. E. Lawrence, and others. The memorial is dated, "New York, October 14, 1853."

A concurrence to the above memorial was signed by John Henry Hobart, A. Cleveland Coxe, Ed. Y. Higbee, Francis Vinton, Isaac Hubbard, and others.

All these are representative names of clergymen prominent in the Church, several of whom afterwards became Bishops, of all schools of churchmanship. The unanimity of their action is, therefore, a noticeable feature.

The memorial, in the introduction, "suggested the general question, whether 'the posture of our

* There should be a reprint of this book, as it contains a valuable record of an important epoch in the history of the American Church. The younger clergy seem to be ignorant of the book and of the ideas and beliefs of the men who contributed to it. It is a curious fact that every important movement of the Church in America in the last fifty years is foreshadowed in The Memorial Papers, and many ecclesiastical conditions of to-day can only be explained by the movements of half a century ago.

Church, with reference to the great moral and social necessities of the day,' was all that could be desired or expected. It suggested, more especially, the inquiry whether her usefulness might not be enlarged by relaxing somewhat the rigidity of the liturgical services, and by conferring her Orders on conditions something less stringent." Church unity, as an ultimate object, is spoken of, and the Episcopate is reckoned as a central bond of union. The bishops are addressed as "a college of Catholic and Apostolic Bishops," and their work is spoken of as that of "an American Catholic Episcopate."

The General Convention of 1853 received the memorial, and appointed a commission of bishops to consider its propositions, and report at the next Convention. The Commission consisted of Bishops Otey, Doane, A. Potter, Burgess, Williams, and Wainwright. The latter soon died, and the report presented at the Convention of 1856 was signed by the first five named bishops.

It will be impossible to give even a synopsis of the report and its appendices, within the present limits, or to deal with more of its matter than refers to the Prayer Book.

The Commission issued a circular and a series of questions, which they widely distributed, and asked for replies in writing. About thirty of the

most valuable of these replies are printed, so as to give a general view of current opinions.

The report refers to the "expediency, not to say necessity, of variety, to some extent, in our liturgical services." It says, "It would appear that all ministers are now expected to be priests, whether they have 'the gift of ministering' or not." It urges the establishment of sisterhoods, the increase of the episcopate, the division of dioceses, and a cultivation of "sacred music." It further says that, with few exceptions, "all of the communications made to us by members of our Church" express the opinion that services ought to be shortened, and a greater variety should obtain. "There is nothing in the rubrics or canons which requires that, when the Holy Communion is administered, it should be preceded, immediately or otherwise, by the Office for daily Prayer. The practice rests merely on usage. . . . The same discretion seems allowable, in respect to the time of using the Litany."

The report unanimously recommended a preamble and resolutions. The passages in these resolutions that bear on these subjects are as follows:

"I. That ministers may, at their discretion, use separately the Office for Morning Prayer; . . . The Litany . . . may be used in the afternoon. . . .

"II. That the Order for the Holy Commun-

ion, in its entireness, may, with a sermon, be used separately. . . .

"III. That the Bishops of the several Dioceses may provide such special services," etc.*

Some quotations from the contributions sent to the Commission will enable us to comprehend more fully the character of this remarkable movement, the awakened zeal of the Church, and the measures proposed for the emergency.

Bishop Doane, of New Jersey, advocates especially, (1) Family training, (2) Pastoral instruction, in the church, in the Sunday-school, in the parish school. He says, A Sunday-school is but a jurymast. It will be rigged only for an emergency. In their original use, Sunday-schools were well conceived. They met a present necessity. But they have grown into a habit of the Church. . . . They have superseded family training. They have superseded pastoral instruction. They have superseded the Church."

Bishop Potter, of Pennsylvania, speaking of the Church, says, "Catholic she is, with her open Bible, her two great creeds, her Apostolic Ministry her sacraments, the centres of Christian commun-

* Bishop Doane, of New Jersey, set forth what was called "A Third Service," and was commonly spoken of as Compline, for use on Sunday nights. It was the universal custom in those days to say Evensong in the afternoon. The special feature of the "Third Service" was the Magnificat.

ion. Might she not be more Catholic in her practices?"

Bishop Burgess, of Maine, says that "of some forty written answers to the queries of the Commission" on Liturgics, there was an unanimous opinion that the services should be separated. He suggests that the Holy Communion should be said separately. On particular occasions, "the Morning Prayer may be held at an earlier hour; or, should this be found inconvenient, it can be recommended to the congregation to perform that portion of the services, excepting the Declaration of Absolution, at home, instead of their family devotions." In regard to the Daily Offices, he says, "It may possibly be deemed better to declare that those clergymen who perform it have full liberty to omit such portions as to each of them may seem expedient." He also says, "A wish has lately been expressed that either the whole Psalter might be so arranged as to classify the psalms for each day with more reference to their tone and subject, or else, at least, that in the penitential season of Lent the more jubilant psalms might be silent."*
Again, he says, "The song of Mary, and that of Simeon, or any of those beautiful passages from the

* This shows a distinct yearning after liturgical enrichment, and also a return to the pre-reformation arrangement of the Psalter. We are now in a fair way to go back to the old order.

Prophets, which, thus introduced, give great richness to the Breviary, there can be no objection so strong as to outweigh the obvious advantage" of their incorporation into the Prayer Book. "It is perhaps the only particular in which Common Prayer does not assert its scriptural authority." He advocates a larger use of music in the services, and refers to the "powerful and delightful effect of the old English carol, the Roman Vesper, the Lutheran hymns, and the Methodist chorus."

Bishop Polk, of Louisiana, says, "We want a larger number and variety of hymns, . . . a re-arrangement of the lessons might be made with advantage, . . . greater freedom in the use of the Psalms," and the separation of the morning services.

Bishop Freeman, of Arkansas, says, "Not, however, by 'lengthening' or by 'shortening'; for I would never consent to touch in the minutest particular, the integrity of the liturgy, but by 'dividing,' or rather authorizing a division or separation of those parts which were doubtless, originally, distinct services."

Dr. Muhlenberg writes, "Since the Church, as a whole, continues the same from ages, and He to whom she brings her offerings changes never, . . . the liturgy* is the grand objective service

* He uses the word in its correct sense, meaning the Holy Eucharist.

of the Church, and therefore, in this degree and kind, should be like the divine object to which it looks—the same yesterday, to-day and forever. In the Communion Office, which is eminently the liturgy, shall not the absent, the sick, the dying communicant, be permitted to send in his petitions to his pastor and brethren to be offered by them amid the sacred mysteries, when intercessions, we may believe, are most availing?"

Dr. Odenheimer, afterward Bishop of New Jersey, writes, "The parochial clergy (should) be urged to develop, to their fullest extent, the rich treasures of devotion already provided for us in our Prayer Book, so that we, or a future generation, may be able to declare more exactly what changes, if any, it may be expedient to make in our liturgical services."

Dr. Francis Vinton writes, "Our liturgy and Articles are not Catholic, but provincial. The Faith (*i.e.*, the Creeds) are Catholic; the Sacraments are Catholic; the requirement of an inward call by the Holy Ghost is Catholic. These Catholic conditions are of God, and they should, therefore, be demanded as conditions precedent to ordination."

Perhaps the most important contribution, and certainly the most learned and exhaustive, was from the pen of the Rev. J. F. Young, afterward

Bishop of Florida. Dr. Young was the ablest liturgical scholar that the Church had produced, at least up to the time of his death in 1885. In his article we get a lucid and concrete statement of the needs and the possibilities of the use of the Prayer Book, and of desirable changes. Dr Young's communication is so good from beginning to end that one is fain to quote it entire; but as that would be impossible, it will be necessary to be content with a few sentences. One is impressed with his clear grasp of the subject. He says, "All substantially which the memorialists ask for, so far as respects the worship of the Church, not only can be granted by the warrant of the best ritual authorities, but would restore our offices much nearer to their original design and use than is our present practice; and this, too, by simply a few rubrical changes, without disturbing in the least the Prayer Book as it is, or changing one word of the body of its contents.

"What is sought for . . . may be embraced under two heads.

"First, more flexibility in the Prayer Book Offices and freedom in their use.

"Secondly, Their fuller adaptation to the Festivals and Fasts, and closer general sympathy with the changes of the ritual year."

Many of the changes and additions adopted

in the Prayer Book revision of 1892 were suggested by Bishop Young in 1855. Among them we find the separation of the Office of the Holy Communion from Matins and Litany, and the abbreviation of Matins, if used with the Eucharist, in almost the identical mode now permitted by the rubrics.

In the Choir Offices, he suggests that "the rubric after the sentences of Scripture be altered in this wise:

"Then shall the Minister say,

"Let us humbly confess our sins unto Almighty God,

"or else,

"Dearly beloved brethren, etc., as now."

He suggests that the daily Morning and Evening Offices begin with the Lord's Prayer, "as was the usage from time immemorial in the Church of England till the revision of 1552."

He suggests also that the exhortation "Dearly beloved in the Lord," etc., "be made discretional." He pleads for a re-arrangement of the Psalms, adapted to the seasons, and for a reform of the Lectionary. He proposes a rubric regulating the use of the Te Deum, providing that it should not be said on penitential days. He suggests this rubric to follow the prayer for the President:

"Here may follow an anthem or hymn."

In the Office of the Holy Communion he suggests:

1. The restoration of the Psalms as Introits.

2. The discretional substitution of the Minor Litany for the Decalogue.

3. "The prayer for the President and any other collects and prayers, if occasion requires," after the Collect for the day.

4. The Nicene Creed to be "said or sung on Sundays and Festivals. . . . On week days, not Feasts, the Creed may be omitted."

5. After the notices, a hymn or anthem.

6. A change to indicate that the people are not to join with the priest in the preface to the Sanctus, as was then the vogue.

7. The singing, during the administration of the Sacrament, of "appropriate Communion anthems," specially referring to the Agnus Dei.

8. In penitential seasons, "when the Gloria in Excelsis is not to be sung, some proper hymn, or post-Communion anthem, may be sung in its stead."

The foregoing extracts show plainly that the leaders of the Church fifty years ago had a true conception of the catholic nature of Christ's Mystical Body; that they believed in Holy Orders, Sacraments and Creeds; that they recognized the Holy Eucharist as the Church's chief act of wor-

ship, and saw the need of a more ornate form of worship than existed in their day. They admitted the principle of Religious Orders, and of lay workers sharing in public services. They saw the need of flexibility in the services and pleaded for ministerial liberty.

We owe an immense debt to the men of fifty years ago, for they revived the catholic spirit of the Church; they took the first steps in the restoration of solemn ceremonial and plain exposition of doctrine. They saw the opportunities that lay before the Church, and they candidly acknowledged the responsibilities that God plainly devolved upon the Church. Those men opened the way, and we have only walked in it.

XII.

The Revision of 1892.

After the Convention of 1856, Prayer Book revision slumbered for twenty-four years, so far as official action was concerned; but the desire to bring the Book into closer conformity with catholic ideals, and to increase its power by flexibility in its use, was daily growing stronger. This desire found expression by many pens and many voices. At length, in the Convention of 1880, the Rev. Wm. R. Huntington, D.D., offered the following resolution:

"Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That a joint committee, to consist of seven bishops, seven presbyters, and seven laymen, be appointed to consider and report to the next General Convention, whether, in view of the fact that this Church is soon to enter upon the second century of its organized existence, the changed conditions of national life do not demand certain alterations in the Book of Common Prayer in the direction of liturgical enrichment and increased flexibility of use."

The resolution was carried, and the committee appointed.

In 1883 the committee reported that they suggested one hundred and ninety-six alterations or

additions. They stated that in their work they decided, that (1) "no alteration should be made touching either statements or standards of doctrine in the Book of Common Prayer"; and (2) that they were "guided by those principles of liturgical construction and ritual use which have guided the compilations and amendment of the Book of Common Prayer, and have made it what it is." They further stated that in the way of additions, they had searched "among the rich stores of devotional forms, which are the common heritage of the Catholic Church." The approved changes, to the number of one hundred and eighty-eight, came before the Convention of 1886. Of these, ninety-nine were adopted. In 1889, eighteen changes were adopted. In 1892, forty-three were adopted, making a total of one hundred and sixty alterations or additions.* Some of these changes were very slight, merely verbal alterations or corrections, but others were of immense value. Some proposed changes were unhappily not incorporated in the book, and some were most happily lost. The Book, as it now stands, needs very little alteration to make it one of the most perfect catholic manuals that the Church has ever known, and it is even now

* Report of the Committee and "The Book Annexed." Genesis of the Prayer Book.

the most perfect Book of Common Prayer that has ever been created.

While the revision committee were at work, hundreds of magazine and newspaper articles were published, and the committee were almost buried beneath the communications and suggestions sent to them. It was a period of rubrical irregularities and liturgical experiments. The ecclesiastical authorities evidently thought it best to give tacit permission to this lawlessness in order that the best use might be discovered; and undoubtedly good came of it, for the clergy found by trial that the Church is wiser than individual men, and that a measurable uniformity is better than parochial individualisms. When the authorized Book was published in 1892, the irregularities ceased, and uniformity was restored, with permissive variations.

We have been using the revised Book for so many years that we have forgotten what the old Book was like, and it will be well to enumerate some of the gains we now enjoy. Some of these might easily pass unnoticed, as they are merely legalized customs which were previously unrubrical, such as the singing of a hymn or anthem during the collection of the alms, and the occasional use in church of that portion of the Burial Office known as the Committal instead of at the grave; or only permissive, like the saying or singing of the Gloria Patri at the end of every

Psalm or Canticle. Other features of the Book are new matter for Americans, and are restorations of our catholic heritage; as, for instance:

1. The whole of the Benedictus in Matins.
2. The Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis.
3. The Anthem after the third Collect at Evensong.
4. The additional Versicles and Responses at Evensong.
5. Permission on week-days to omit the Exhortation at Matins, and the Exhortation, Confession and Absolution at Evensong, and at both Offices to omit the prayers after the Collects, thus restoring the Offices almost to their form and dimensions in the Book of 1549.
6. Permission to say the Collect for a Sunday or other feast at Evensong on the day previous, thus recognizing the old order of First Evensong for Festivals.
7. Permission to substitute the ancient Kyrie for the Decalogue.*

* In the Book of 1549 the printing of the Kyrie shows that each petition is to be said three times; thrice to the Father, thrice to the Son, thrice to the Holy Ghost.

When the Kyrie is said, as at a Low Celebration, the following is the manner of recitation:

Priest—Lord, have mercy upon us.
People—Lord, have mercy upon us.
Priest—Lord, have mercy upon us.
People—Christ, have mercy upon us.
Priest—Christ, have mercy upon us.
People—Christ, have mercy upon us.
Priest—Lord, have mercy upon us.
People—Lord, have mercy upon us.
Priest—Lord, have mercy upon us.

8. Compulsory use of the Nicene Creed in the Eucharist on certain feasts.

9. Discretionary use of the long Exhortations in the Eucharist.

10. The recognition of the Oblation and the Invocation in the Eucharist.

11. The addition of Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, for early Eucharists on Christmas Day and Easter Day.

12. The statement that Morning Prayer, Litany, and Holy Communion, "are distinct services, and may be used separately or together."

13. The appointment of the feast of the Transfiguration.

14. The appointment of Proper Psalms for the Circumcision, the Epiphany, the Purification, the Annunciation, Easter-Even, Trinity Sunday, the Transfiguration, Michaelmas, and All Saints' Day.

15. The insertion of a Lesson in the Order of Confirmation, and a form of presentation of candidates, both emphasizing the "laying-on of hands" and the gift of the Holy Ghost, as the essentials of Confirmation.

16. The separation of the Selection of Psalms in the Burial Office, and the printing of the Gloria after each portion, and the addition of the final prayer taken from the Scotch Liturgy.

17. "A Penitential Office for Ash Wednesday," with discretionary use at other times.

18. A table of Twenty Selections of Psalms, providing for flexibility and possible congruity in the Offices.

19. The restoration of the original form of "Collect for Aid against Perils."

20. The restriction of the "Office of Institution of Ministers" to Rectors of Parishes.

21. The relegation of the "Articles of Religion" to the end of the volume, and their separation from the Prayer Book in the Table of Contents. This change took the Articles out of the Book of Common Prayer. Without questioning the orthodoxy of the Articles, it is nevertheless true that they are provincial, and have no place in a catholic Prayer Book.

It will be observed that almost every change that was made in 1892 was in the direction of 1549, or the period that preceded it. The late Bishop of Connecticut once pointed out to the author that every revision of the Prayer Book since 1552 had returned to some extent to the first Book, and that no change had ever been made in a protestant direction. There has been a gradual but distinct and decided assertion of the catholic position of the Church in her forms of worship. With the text of the Prayer Book as we have it to-day,

and with the restored ceremonial of 1548, we can very nearly reproduce the services that fulfilled the ideal of the men who produced the first English Prayer Book, which book, it was claimed, was prepared under the influence of the Holy Ghost.

There is, however, one point in which our present Book is defective, and that is in the arrangement of the various sections of the Order of the Holy Eucharist. That service was disjointed by the radicals of 1552, and no revision committee, king, parliament, or general convention, has had the courage to set the parts together as they belong. They were made disjecta membra with a purpose, for the Protestants three and a half centuries ago determined to destroy, or at least to maim, catholic worship as far as they could. They took the Gloria in Excelsis out of its logical, liturgical, and historical position after the Kyrie, and put it at the end, just before the Blessing, where it produces the effect of an anti-climax, and commemorates the Incarnation after the Atonement. They separated the Prayer for the Church from the Prayer of Consecration, so as to discountenance the idea of intercession with sacrificial offering. They put the Confession, Absolution, Comfortable Words, and Prayer of Access, before the Consecration, so as to confuse the idea of sacrificial worship and communion.

Very strenuous efforts were made before 1892 to restore these portions of the service (except the Gloria) to their original position, and the change was almost effected by the Convention. It is maddening to think that it was lost by one lay vote, the Bishops and Clerical Deputies having adopted it. The change involved no alteration of the text, nor of a rubric; nothing but the transposition of parts of the service to their original places.

Without doubt, at some future date, the proper order will be restored; and in the meantime we must possess our souls in patience.

XIII.

Some Observations.

I. The introduction of the Decalogue into the Liturgy is sometimes defended on the ground that it is a restoration of the ancient lection from the Old Testament technically called "The Prophecy." The argument is not a good one, for the Prophecy was a variable selection, almost always taken from the writing of a prophet, and was changed from day to day with the Epistle and Gospel. Had the Prophecy been introduced it would have been in accordance with ancient usage indeed, but it would have been a distinct novelty in the sixteenth century, since it had long disappeared from English Missals, and the Reformers were aiming at simplicity and correction, not striving for enrichment.

II. In the Book of 1549, after the consecration of the Elements in the Holy Communion, this rubric occurs:

"These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the Altar, without any elevation or strance, and shown to the people.

This rubric is often thought to forbid elevation, but, in view of the principle laid down by the revisionists, it cannot be so construed. While the Reformers maintained that a national Church has

the right to change or abolish ceremonies of human origin, they were strenuous only to preserve those which were apostolic and catholic. Elevation of the Sacred Species in offering to the Father, is a ritual act common to all Liturgies, and goes back into the remotest antiquity. The elevation referred to was evidently a different one, and of late origin. The order for the priest not to turn from the altar, and not to show the Sacrament to the people, confirms this view. In the proper liturgical elevation, the priest does not turn toward the people and show the Sacrament to them. The elevation which was forbidden was evidently a ceremony similar to that used in Benediction of the Sacrament, when the Host is placed in a monstrance, and shown to the people.

III. The expression in the Litany, "from sudden death, Good Lord, deliver us," is frequently understood to mean that we are to pray that our death may be preceded by an illness of at least a few days' duration. In the face of the common experience of mankind, the petition cannot have been intended to bear such an interpretation. Sudden and even violent death is not uncommon; by accident, by heart disease, by battle, by shipwreck, and by a thousand other causes; and such deaths were at least as frequent three hundred and fifty years ago as they are now. Sometimes a gloss

is put upon the words, making them read, "from sudden and unprepared death." That is doubtless nearer the true meaning. But it is submitted that what the Reformers intended to express was that God would give us time to receive the last rites of the Church, Confession and Absolution, Unction and Holy Communion before we die. This explanation appears only reasonable when we reflect that the Catholic Church has always attached great importance to the viaticum before the soul's departure.

IV. It is regarded as a strong point in the case against incense, that there is not a single rubric in the Prayer Book respecting its use. And yet the absence of direction is no argument at all, for the Book contains very few rubrics concerning ceremonies. All the rubrics that are inserted in the text of any service refer to words that are to be said, except those which give directions concerning the offering of the alms and oblations, and that which directs the placing of the consecrated Elements upon the Holy Table after all have communicated. And even one of the offertory rubrics relates to words: "then may be sung a Hymn or an Anthem," etc. Two other rubrics may seem to be exceptions to the rule, but are not, being of a disciplinary nature. They occur in the Visitation of the Sick, and the Visitation of Pris-

oners, and in both instances refer to the spiritual condition of those visited. Of the three rubrics that precede the Order for the Holy Communion, two are disciplinary, and the third refers to the position and vesting of the altar. The direction as to the posture of the priest is in connection with words which he is to say. All the rubrics which are printed at the beginning or end of any Office refer to discipline, or to words that are to be said. The Prayer Book is consistent as a "Book of Common Prayer," and hence only gives directions that concern the people. This point ought to be emphasized, as it is of great importance. If the Prayer Book were a complete directory of worship, like the Sarum Missal and Breviary, the secret, or private prayers, and ceremonial acts of the officiating priest would have been put in the book.

We find these features in all the primitive Liturgies, and they are evidence that the books were original compositions. But when a Prayer Book has an ancestry, it shows its descent by its incompleteness. This is the case with the modern Roman Missal, which, while giving rubrical commands for the use of incense, contains no sufficient directions concerning the ceremonial. The ceremonial of the censer is contained in another book, the Ceremoniale. If our Prayer Book gave complete rules for ceremonial acts, including the manner

of censing, a liturgical scholar might become suspicious of its origin. Richard Baxter's proposed book was not lacking in minuteness, for it was a brand new production.* The omissions of the Prayer Book are evidences of pedigree.

V. The third rubric before "The Order for the Holy Communion" in the American Prayer Book contains a curious and mysterious parenthesis:

"And the Minister, standing at the right side of the Table, or where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said, shall say," etc.

This rubric is peculiar to the American Book, and owes its existence to the unique arrangement of S. Peter's Church, Philadelphia. Bishop William White was Rector of S. Peter's as well as Diocesan of Pennsylvania at the time that our Prayer Book was adopted. In S. Peter's Church, the altar is at the east end, and the pulpit is at the west end, with the reading pew under it. Access to this pew and the pulpit can only be had from the sacristy behind. The officiant, having said Matins, retires to the sacristy and issues into the church by a side door, and walks the whole length of the church to begin the Eucharist at the altar. After the Creed, he must return to the sacristy, and mount the pulpit stairs. The sermon ended,

* Savoy Conference, 1661.

he is obliged to retrace his steps to the altar. Bishop White objected to these frequent journeyings, and so asked the General Convention to permit him to say what is incorrectly called the "Ante-Communion service," in the reading pew. There was not much liturgical science in those days (1789), and the Convention saw no impropriety in granting his request.* The Pro-Anaphora, or that part of the Liturgy that precedes the Offertory, had been so long divorced from the rest of the service and united to Matins, that nearly everyone had come to regard it as part of the Morning Prayer, and thought that the service of the Eucharist began with the exhortation, "Dearly beloved in the Lord." There is probably no living person who has heard the Kyrie, Collect, Epistle and Gospel, read from a stall.

VI. The insertion of the Ornaments Rubric in the Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth (1562), was made necessary by the Injunctions of Queen Mary. That sovereign had restored the whole Roman ritual and ornaments as they were in England before Henry VIII. began reforms, and when Elizabeth ascended the throne the unreformed rites were legally binding. The adoption of the Ornaments Rubric undid and repealed all Mary's re-

* This curious bit of history was told the author by the late Dr. John Williams, Bishop of Connecticut.

actionary ecclesiastical legislation in that direction and restored the status of the Reformation. Had that rubric been omitted, the Clergy would have been in sad straits to fit the Book of A.D. 1562 to the intricate and corrupt ceremonial of A.D. 1500.

VII. The Book of 1549 permits a shortened celebration of the Eucharist on week-days in the following rubric:

"When the Holy Communion is celebrated on the work-day, or in private houses, then may be omitted the Gloria in Excelsis, the Creed, the Homily (or sermon), and the exhortation beginning, 'Dearly beloved,'" etc.

This rubric shows that the integrity of the service would not be impaired by the above-named omissions, It was the old custom to omit the Creed and Gloria at Nuptial and Requiem Masses. There is no authority for such omissions now, except in case of the Exhortation, and none whatever for omitting the Prayer of Access, and other portions that refer to communion, but a rubric in the American Book allows the substitution of a hymn for the Gloria.

VIII. The question is often asked, How did the vestments fall into disuse in the Church of England? It is not a difficult question to answer. There is abundant evidence to show that the spoli-

ation begun by Henry VIII. and finished by the Puritans under Cromwell, deprived churches, from cathedrals to roadside chapels, of all their ornaments, chalices, crosses, statues, pictures, vestments, censers, and everything else that could be carried away, or be broken, or be defaced. Even the records of parishes were destroyed in the devastation of the twenty years of the Great Rebellion. When the public worship of the Church and the use of the Prayer Book were restored, there was little left in ornaments, except such things as had been secreted, and so had escaped the spoilers. Churches had, therefore, to provide all the adjuncts of worship, and, in the impoverished condition of clergy and people, the simplest and most easily obtained ornaments and vestments were made to suffice. It was sometimes, no doubt, difficult to procure even a surplice, for very often the church building was in a ruinous condition, windowless and even roofless. All the money that could be raised would be necessarily expended upon the fabric to make it habitable. In the lapse of years the clergy and people became accustomed to worship with the barest necessities, and as a generation had grown up since the king had been beheaded, and all had been influenced more or less by the dominant Puritanism, the want of splendor in worship ceased to be perceived.

The law required then, as it does now, that the churchwardens shall provide such utensils, ornaments and vestments as are required for the due and solemn offering of public worship, and it is the duty of the bishop of the diocese to see that the wardens provide them. But one can understand how reluctant a bishop would be to enforce the law upon impoverished parishes. The late Bishop Philpotts of Exeter says,* that the vestments have been disused "because the parishioners —that is, the churchwardens, who represent the parishioners—have neglected their duty to provide them; for such is the duty of the parishioners by the plain and express canon law of England. True, it would be a very costly duty, and for that reason, most probably, churchwardens have neglected it, and archdeacons have connived at the neglect. But be this as it may, if the churchwardens of Helston shall provide this duty, at the charge of the parish, providing an alb, a vestment (*i.e.*, a chasuble), and a cope, as they might in strictness be required to do, I shall enjoin the minister, be he whom he may, to use them. But until these ornaments are provided by the parishioners, it is the duty of the minister to use the garment actually provided by them for him, which is the surplice."

* Answer to the parishioners of Helston, when they desired him to prohibit the use of the surplice in the pulpit. 1840.

IX. On Easter Day, instead of Venite Exultemus Domino (Ps. 95), we sing Pascha Nostrum (Christ our Passover, etc.). Searching for the origin of this Anthem,* we find in the Book of 1549, under the heading "Easter Day," this rubric:

"In the Morning, afore Matins, the people being assembled in the Church, these anthems shall be first solemnly sung or said."†

Then follow "Christ being raised," etc., and "Christ is risen from the dead," etc. After each antiphon, "Alleluia" is sung. Then follow this versicle and response:

"V. Show forth to all nations the glory of God.

R. And among all people His wonderful works."

The priest then says:

"Let us pray.

"O God, Who for our redemption," etc. (Our Collect for the "First Communion" on Easter Day.)

We note first that it was the evident intention of the Reformers that Matins should always precede the Eucharist. There are several places in the

* Anthem, in liturgical language, means Antiphon. Our word is a corruption.

† Said, technically means simply intoned; sung means rendered according to a more elaborate notation.

Book that show this intention. Secondly, that the people were expected to attend Matins. Thirdly, that there was to be an interval between the two services.* Matins, as arranged by the Reformers, was quite a short Office, and made a good "Ante-Communion Service." And, fourthly, the first Celebration was plainly the principal service of the day, and was doubtless sung at an early hour. In olden days, morning services always began at early hours. On the continent of Europe, this is still the rule. High Mass in the cathedrals seldom begins later than nine o'clock, and the Papal Mass in S. Peter's, or the Sistine Chapel, sometimes begins at eight o'clock. The "sacred hour of half-past ten" or eleven o'clock is a modern innovation. People could easily communicate at the High Celebration at eight or nine o'clock, though they find it a real hardship to fast till noon.

Returning to the Pascha Nostrum, we find that it was sung before Matins began, and was therefore a service by itself. It was in fact the short Office that precedes a Procession.

Our common custom of singing hymns in procession before and after every service is meaningless, and without authority or precedent. There

* "As many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion, shall signify their names to the Curate over night, or else in the morning afore the beginning of Matins, or immediately after."—First Rubric before the Order of the Holy Communion.

should only be a choral procession on great feasts or great fasts, or on special occasion, like the visitation of the bishop. The procession should not issue from the choir-room or sacristy, but from the choir, and should be begun with some such Office as that provided for Easter Day. Having made the round of the church, the procession should return to the choir, and the service should then begin.

The Easter Anthems were ordered to be solemnly sung. Solemn, in liturgical language, means "with the use of incense," as *e.g.,* Solemn Mass, or Solemn Vespers, or Solemn Procession. Hence, the meaning of the rubric is, that on Easter morning there should be a procession around the church, with incense.

X. In our American Prayer Book, "The Form of Solemnization of Matrimony" is shorn of much of the beauty and significance of the old rite. In the English Book, it remains almost precisely as the Reformers arranged it. But we have cut it down, until now it is commonly said that "it takes only eight minutes to marry a couple." This extreme brevity and plainness is very likely one cause of the elaborate ritual and ceremonial of bridesmaids, maid of honor, ushers in procession, studied (and rehearsed) positions, efforts after the picturesque, softly played organ

during the service, and all the other accompaniments that fashion has decreed and complacent rectors permit. The "eight minute service" is so short, that people think it hardly worth while to go to church for it, and so they either add to it the above-mentioned vanities, or are "quietly married at home." Compare this with the dignity of the "Form" in the old Book. The marriage takes place in the body of the church; not even in the choir, much less at the altar. (Our custom of marrying at the altar is borrowed from Roman usage.) After the couple are married, they go into the choir while Ps. cxxviii. or Ps. lxvii. are sung. "The Psalm ended, the Man and Woman kneeling before the Altar, the Priest standing at the Altar, and turning his face toward them, shall say,"

Here follow the short Kyrie, the Lord's Prayer, several Versicles and Responses, and two Prayers, and then the Priest blesses them a second time, with these words:

"Almighty God, which at the beginning did create our first parents, Adam and Eve, and did sanctify and join them together in marriage; Pour upon you the riches of His grace, sanctify and ✠ bless you, that ye may please Him both in body and soul; and live together in holy love unto your lives' end. Amen."

Here follows a rubric: "Then shall be said

after the Gospel, a Sermon, wherein," etc. "Or, if there be no Sermon, the Minister shall read this that followeth."

In the modern English Book, the words "after the Gospel" are omitted. It is plain from this rubric that marriages in the time of the Reformation took place before the Celebration of the Holy Communion, and consequently, rather early in the morning. Marriage in those days was looked upon as a Sacrament, and the marriage tie was a religious obligation. It was cemented by Holy Communion, as we know from the final rubric:

"The new married persons (the same day of their Marriage) must receive the Holy Communion."

We can well understand the horror with which people who held such a view of Marriage regarded the divorce of Henry VIII.

When evening marriages are discontinued, when they take place in the morning in association with Holy Communion, we shall get rid of the utter unseemliness of women in church in party gowns, with bare heads and shoulders and arms; and then a wedding will cease to be what is now, "a full dress affair," with brilliant toilets as the chief feature.

XI. The Prayer Book is a compilation derived from many sources. The general structure is

taken from the Sarum Missal and Breviary, but to this have been added extracts from other forms of worship. The compilers followed the rule laid down by S. Gregory for S. Augustine of Canterbury in the close of the sixth century, to take the best elements from all available books, and combine them in a Use for England. We have instances of this method of adaptation in the Litany, where we find extracts from the Uses of Sarum, York, Hereford, Paris, Rome, and Hermann's Litany. In the Minor Litany, *e.g.,* the versicle, "O Lord, deal not with us according to our sins" (Ps. ciii. 10), and the response, "Neither reward us according to our iniquities" (Job xi. 6), are taken from Hermann's Litany, and the versicle, "O Lord, let Thy mercy be showed upon us" (Ps. xxxii. 10), and the response, "As we do put our trust in Thee" (Ps. xxxiii. 21), are taken from the Sarum Office of Prime. The manner in which they are printed (Minister and Answer), show that they are inserted. The "Let us pray" which follows each group, indicates the sequence of a prayer instead of a suffrage. When the Minor Litany is omitted, the "Let us pray" before the prayer "We humbly beseech Thee," is not to be said. The rubric shows this.

XII. As has been shown, the Lord's Prayer in the Mass of 1549 follows the Prayer of Consecration. It is said by the priest alone as far as "And

lead us not into temptation," and then the people respond "But deliver us from evil. Amen." The doxology does not occur attached to the Lord's Prayer until 1661, and it is not known who added it at that time. Bishop Cosin gave directions to the printer, "Never print the Lord's Prayer beyond—deliver us from evil. Amen." Blunt says,* "In the Liturgies of the East, after 'deliver us from evil,' the priest offers a prayer against the evil and the Evil One, called the Embolismus; and the doxology is then sung by the people." Probably this is a primitive usage; and the antiphon so sung has crept into the text of the Gospel.†

In our present Book of Common Prayer, both English and American, the Lord's Prayer follows the Communion and is preceded by a rubric requiring the people to repeat "every petition" after the priest. It is quite evident that this rubric was aimed at the overthrow of the ancient custom, continued in the Book of 1549. It was intended that the priest should utter a petition and then pause while the congregation repeated it, and so on, ending with "deliver us from evil."

In Morning and Evening Prayer the people are directed to say the Lord's Prayer "with" the priest. Hence when the doxology was added the rubric covered it without confusion, but in the Order for

* Ann. Bk. Com. Pr.

† The Doxology is supposed not to have been in the original of S. Matthew, as it is not in S. Luke.

Holy Communion the effect is different. Here the people are not to say "with" the priest, but to repeat "after" him. This also would be plain of comprehension and obedience had not the compilers of the Book of 1552 been so determined to change old customs. They made the rubric read "repeat after him every petition." They neglected to provide for the recitation of the initial words of the prayer " Our Father, who art in heaven," which are an invocation, not a petition. But when the doxology was added the rubric was left unchanged. How are the invocation and the doxology to be said? They are not petitions, and therefore, according to a strict interpretation of the rubric, the people are not to say them at all. The rubric reads, "Then shall the Minister say the Lord's Prayer, the people repeating after him every Petition." Therefore, the priest should say the whole prayer, and the people should repeat after him only the seven petitions, he pausing to give them time to say the words.

Of course no one is so silly as to give such a strict practical interpretation, but, taken on its face, that is what the rubric orders. The rubric, as it stands in the Prayer Book, is an enigma, and it would be the despair of a liturgist if the Prayer Book were an original composition and if the Church that set it forth were a man-created organization.

XIV.

Choirs and Music at the Time of the Reformation.

One would hardly expect to find the parish "clark" of the eighteenth century and the early half of the nineteenth a link in the chain of evidence for the continuity of the Church, and yet he is a link, and by no means a weak one. The clerk occupied the lowest story of the old "three-decker" combination of "reading pews" and pulpit, and performed vicariously the people's part in the service. He read the Psalms antiphonally with the priest, and said all the Responses and Amens. He "set the tunes" for the metrical psalms and the few hymns then in use, and he led the singing. Often there were no musical instruments, and if there were any they generally were a violin or two, with a bass viol, and possibly a trombone.

The clerk, ancient as he seemed to be, was more ancient than he appeared, for he came down, without a break from the middle ages.

It is a common opinion that prior to the Reformation every church in England had a more or less elaborate choral service, sung by a choir of men and boys, but the opinion can hardly be called correct. Choral service was unquestionably universal, and in cathedrals and great monastic churches it was

elaborate. There were choirs of men, and also of men and boys, but these were to be found as a rule only in the great churches. The ordinary parish church had no choir, and no organ, although the services were always choral. The priest sang his part, and the Responses were made by one or two men who had been taught to sing and to read Latin. Congregational singing was confined to a few well-known hymns. These were set to ancient plainsong melodies, or, in the fifteenth century to popular glee or dance tunes.

In the monasteries the services were sung by the monks, though boys were sometimes employed in addition; but in cathedrals and royal chapels elaborate and difficult music was sung by trained choirs of men and boys. It is probable that the men were often in minor orders.

The mediaeval parish clerk clung to life with great tenacity, and he has only disappeared within the last fifty years, having been pushed out by the new vested choir. He still survives in the Roman Church, and one may hear him in Canada, in France, in Italy, where he alone sings the Amens and other Responses.*

The vested choir has existed in England from

* One of the best choirs in Paris is attached to the Church of S. Sulpice, yet a single bass voice sings all the Responses. The writer has heard the same thing in Quebec, in Florence, in Rome, in Siena, and many other places.

the early Christian times, but its introduction into parish churches is a modern novelty. It is a link, like the parish clerk, that binds together the past and present; and the choir and clerk together are legitimate traditions in the continuous Church.

During the middle ages church music became debased in company with doctrine, morals, and a good many other things. The mediæval composers obscured the text of the services with elaborate melodies and fantastic contrapuntal forms. Sometimes as many as twenty bars were sung to a single syllable. The "motif" was often repeated, enlarged and inverted in the Amen of Gloria, Credo or Sanctus, and was called the "pneuma." It was meaningless and unedifying to the last degree. Church music was reckoned among the abuses that needed to be reformed. The first step was taken in England, about 1543, twenty years before the Council of Trent took up the matter, although as early as 1526 Cardinal Wolsey had ordered plainsong and forbidden "prick-song," or elaborately scored music.*

The mind of the Reformers was clearly expressed when the Prayer Book of 1549 was issued. Archbishop Cranmer ordered John Merbecke, the

* So called because the notes were "pricked" or dotted with the point of a pen.

foremost musician in England, to set the book to music.*

Merbecke did not invent melodies, but, acting under instruction, adjusted the English words to the music in use from immemorial times, and in this adjustment he was directed not to place more than one note, or group of necessarily related notes, upon a syllable. His setting is nothing but adapted plainsong. His work, says W. S. R. in Grove's "Dictionary of Music," was done "with so perfect an appreciation of the true feeling of Plain Song, that one can only wonder at the ingenuity with which it is not merely translated into a new language, but so well fitted to the exigencies of the 'vulgar tongue' that the words and music might well be supposed to have sprung into existence together." It is quite evident that the Reformers had not the least idea of departing from the ancient choral service and ritual song.†

A Royal Injunction issued by Elizabeth in 1559 directs that there shall be "a modest and distinct

* "The Book of Common Praier noted," wherein "is contayned so much of the Order of Common Praier as is to be sung in Churches."

† In 1544 "a Litany with suffrages to be said or sung" was set forth "by the King's Majestie, and his Clergie." This was set to the beautiful and simple old Litany and published by Grafton, the King's Printer, with harmonies in five parts, a month after its first appearance.—Blunt, Am. Bk. of Com. Pr., p. lx. (Fourth edition, Rivingtons.)

"To say" meant monotonic recitation; "to sing," meant melodic rendering.

song so used in all parts of the Common Prayer in the Church, that the same might be understanded as if it were read without singing."

The Injunction ordered plainsong in collegiate and parish churches, but exempted cathedrals and college chapels. These were permitted to use the "prick-song." It is to this exemption that the "cathedral service" of the present day owes its origin. The compositions of Tallis, Farrant, Bird, Purcell, Boyce, and other English masters of counterpoint or "prick-song" were written because the Injunction permitted such music to be sung in cathedrals.*

It was also permitted "for the comforting of such that delight in music," either at the beginning or at the end of services to sing a "hymn or suchlike song to the praise of Almighty God."† This "hymn" has developed into the modern anthem. The rubric that ordered the anthem after the third collect at Matins or Evensong in "quires and places where they sing," meant cathedrals, and such churches as had competent choirs.

It is evident from this order, and from contemporary evidence, that the musical rendering of the services was continued, but that the hand of reform had been laid upon the character of the

* Blunt's "History of the Reformation of the Church of England," p. 358.

† Ibid.

music. From this we are not to infer that the ancient simplicity was restored, though evidently an effort was made to bring this about, but that the music was purged from the secular melodies and meaningless embellishments that degraded it. Indeed, we may date from this period a genuine revival of Church music. It was the period that produced Palestrina and Guidetti, and, somewhat later, Allegri. These men wrote music of such intricate harmony and exquisite choral effects that only choirs of the highest order of voice and training can sing it. The same development went on in England after the Reformation, and by men who, like Tallis, passed through all the changes of the period. Tallis was a great musician, whose influence is felt to this day, and whose music is as fresh to-day as it was three hundred and fifty years ago. He was connected with the choir of the Chapel Royal through the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary I. and Elizabeth, and died in 1585. He wrote much music. His anthem in forty parts is a monument of art and skill. Tallis' compositions and their relation to the Prayer Book bear their testimony to the continuous life of the Church of England, and show in plain language the catholic foundation and the chastened expression imparted by the Reformation.

The choral service went on for another century, although Puritanism was gaining in strength and boldness, and we hear nothing more until the Savoy Conference, when the Puritans strongly objected to the "plain tune" for the Lessons. The clergy at first refused to yield, saying that the objections were groundless; but they finally conceded that the monotone might be dispensed with in reading the Lessons. This was just before the review of the Prayer Book in 1661. The concession implies that all parts of the service but the Lessons should be sung. This is the last word that the Church has uttered upon the subject of music, but it is an important word, for it connects the Church of to-day with the Church of the Stuarts and the Tudors, the twentieth century with the seventeenth, the sixteenth and the fifteenth, with S. Gregory and S. Ambrose, and the fifth century and the fourth.

XV.

The Mediaeval Tendency.

Whether or not the compilers of the Prayer Book of 1549 went too far in their effort to secure simplicity of worship, is a debatable question. They had an enormous and difficult task before them, and they accomplished it in the way that seemed best to them. The Choir Offices as they found them were complicated beyond all reason, and were far too ornate even for the trained clergy to use with devotion, and were entirely beyond the possibility of use by the people. The compilers therefore threw them aside, and took the ancient Roman, Sarum, and German Offices as the models upon which to construct the new services. The Matins and Evensong in the Book of 1549 were so simple that even the unlettered could easily learn them, and they seemed to promise that all people would find them a help to a true, spiritual worship. But, however acceptable this simplicity was to the laity, it seems that it did not commend itself to the scholarly clergy, for in the Book of 1552 we find a tendency to return to a more ornate use. It is true that the additions to the Offices were not made in a catholic direction, but neither were the elaborations of mediæval days, and the same may

be said of the tendency toward enrichment that prevails at the present time.

The most conspicuous innovations in the Book of 1552 were the Exhortation, Confession and Absolution prefixed to Matins. The idea of these features was borrowed from a French Prayer Book, though our forms bear but slight resemblance to those which suggested them. The intention of those who inserted them in the Book was to make them a substitute for private and definite Confession and particular Absolution. Another glaring innovation was the introduction of the Decalogue into the Communion Service—an act without precedent. This was done at the instance of Dr. Herman, Archbishop of Cologne. And following this was a return to mediævalism of the rankest kind in the substitution of the Responses to the Commandments for the ancient ninefold Kyrie. One of the abuses of the Middle Ages was the "farcing" or "stuffing" of Responses, the Agnus, the Benedictus, the Gloria, and other numbers of the various services, particularly in the Mass.* "Lord

* The following is a specimen of mediaeval "farcing." It is part of the Gloria in Excelsis as ordered to be said on feasts of the B. V. M. according to the unreformed Sarum Use:

O Lord, the only-begotten Son Jesus Christ—"O Spirit and kind Comforter of orphans."—O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father,—"First begotten of the Virgin-Mother Mary"—that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer —"to the glory of Mary." Thou that sittest, etc.

For thou only art holy—"sanctifying Mary"; thou only

have mercy upon us" is primitive and catholic; "and incline our hearts to keep this law," is mediæval.

As we trace the history of the Prayer Book, we find one "enrichment" after another put in to complicate the order of worship. It is a question whether we have not elaborated too far. We have, for example, in our American Book three sets of Canticles at Evensong. How is any layman to know which is to be sung? And how, unless the choir sing very distinctly, can he know which is being sung? The writer was recently placed in this very position, and realized that Nunc Dimittis was being sung and not Benedic Anima Mea or Deus Misereatur, only because the Gloria came after the fourth verse. The Gospel Canticles are quite sufficient.

In the matter of the Psalter we have practically returned to mediæval use. What with the Proper Psalms and the twenty Selections, it is possible to ignore a great portion of the Psalter. And this is done in so many churches that there is a growing unfamiliarity with the Psalms. In many churches where the Psalms are sung, one rarely

art the Lord—"ruling Mary";—thou only—"crowning Mary,"—O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high, etc.

On the same festivals the Benedictus was changed from "Blessed is He that cometh," to "Blessed is the Son of Mary that cometh."

hears those appointed for the day, and when the 15th evening occurs a Selection is always chosen.

The American Book, more than the English, shows this return to mediævalism. The opening Sentences in the English Matins and Evensong are all penitential, and suggest the Confession that is to follow; but we have some Sentences that are jubilant or doctrinal, and some appointed to be said on certain feasts or fasts, having no relation to the Confession. They are frankly intended to harmonize with the day. If it be desirable to return to pre-reformation uses, these Sentences are all right, only they are in the wrong place. As long as the Confession and Absolution are retained, they should be regarded as preparatory to the service, and the proper Sentence that is to give the keynote of the Office, should be introduced as an Antiphon before the Venite at Matins or before the Psalms at Evensong.

Did the Reformers go too far? Is there a real and natural desire on the part of the people for more elaborate services? It would seem that there is such a desire, for there appears to be no movement toward simplicity, but rather in the contrary direction. And then the question arises, May not this craving be satisfied by allowing a ceremonial that will leave the text in its original simplicity? This was undoubtedly the case in the

early years of the Reformation. Copes and dalmatics and chasubles were worn, incense was burned, candles were lighted, crosses were carried, psalms were sung with rulers of the choir, and prayers were intoned, and yet the text of the Prayer Book was simpler than it has ever been since. Did the complications of the text come into being because the ceremonial was reduced?

We must not forget that the Prayer Book is a Book of "Common Prayer," and if it is to serve its purpose, it should be of such a character that it can be used by a missionary ministering to illiterate people, or by a cultured congregation in a stately cathedral. Let the form be simple, as was the case with all primitive Liturgies, and let the elaboration, if it be desired, be given in the character of the music and the solemnity of the ceremonial. There are two conflicting ideas at work in men's minds: namely, general uniformity and allowable diversity. The conflict can be reconciled by a required and rigid uniformity in the text, and a recognized liberty and flexibility in the ceremonial.

If there should be a future revision of the Prayer Book, it is to be hoped that no attempt will be made to "enrich" the text; but should there be any change, let us hope that it will be in excision of such portions of the Choir Offices as seem super-

fluous. We have probably secured as much enrichment as it is possible to have in services that call for intelligent participation on the part of lay people. If there were more variations, or a multiplication of Antiphons. Responds, or Canticles, the minds of the people would become confused and discouraged, and the object of a Common Prayer would be defeated. There must be a good deal of simplicity in worship that claims lay co-operation; and richness of form must be sacrificed to heartiness of devotion. The cumbrous ceremonies of a Greek or Roman High Mass may be instructive to a theologian and delightful to a liturgical scholar, but they are neither impressive nor instructive to the people. As a consequence, one finds that the congregation at such functions pay little heed to what goes on at the altar, and occupy themselves with their private devotions. At a Greek Mass the people pay scant attention except at the Great Entrance and during the Consecration; and at a Roman Mass the people lay aside their books of devotion only when the priest comes to the Sursum Corda. It may be claimed that both Oriental and Roman congregations show great devotion at the Consecration, and pay reverent homage to Christ. But the same may be said of any well-trained congregation using the Book of Common Prayer; and in addition, we have a whole congregation of peo-

ple worshipping as a single body, from the beginning to the end of the service. Such a service is a great act of public worship of Almighty God, and not a mere agglomeration of people engaged in private devotion and only uniting in a single act of adoration. There is really no comparison between the two systems, proceeding as they do from different theories. The Greek or the Roman "assists" by his presence; the Anglican assists by voice and posture and understanding. The Reformers of 1549 grasped this thought very clearly, and framed the new Book to fit the expression of this higher theory of public worship.

It may not be the fashion now-a-days to attach much value to the words and acts of the Anglican Reformers, nor to think much of that kind of Churchmanship that is satisfied with Sunday Matins as the week's worship of Almighty God; but at least the history of Anglo-Saxon Christianity in the last three and a half centuries demonstrates quite plainly that the theory of Common Prayer and its illustration by the use of the Prayer Book has produced a sturdy and conscientious people. While it may be claimed with justice that many characteristics are racial, such as truth, honor, generosity, and fair-mindedness, yet it can also be claimed that these elements of character owe their development to the form of Christianity that the

Prayer Book illustrates and promotes. How much of the lofty tone of thought and high standard of morality and altruism are due to the principle of common worship as set forth in the Prayer Book? And how much of the timid and abashed worship of God that we find among us, and wherein we fall short of other Christian nations, is due to the neglect of the plain, catholic teaching of the Prayer Book in the matter of the Holy Eucharist? Interpret and use the Book in its original sense, as a manual of worship for clergy and people alike, as an expression of the service due to God from a corporate body, as a connecting link with the devotion of the Holy Church from the Apostles to our own day, and it will be found to be the best guide for a worshipping congregation that the Church has yet produced.

Note A.

There is a prevalent opinion that the Prayer Book does not recognize the use of the word "Altar," because the word is not found in the English Book, and only exists in the Office of Institution in the American Book. It is supposed that the deliberate substitution of the name "Lord's Table" or "Holy Table" for "Altar," as used in the Book of 1549, meant the repudiation of the idea of sacrifice. It is doubtless true that the revolutionists of 1552 had some such purpose in view; or, at least, that they aimed at magnifying the communion idea of the Eucharist, communion having been so much neglected. But, as has been pointed out, the Book of 1552 was never legalized, and therefore is of no authority. However, in all subsequent revisions the terms Lord's Table and Holy Table have been retained, even by the highest and best instructed Churchmen. The reason for this retention is that the terms are technically correct.

The word Altar is comprehensive, and includes not only the structure upon which the Sacrament is celebrated, but also the gradines upon which the ornaments stand, the tabernacle in which the Sacrament is reserved, and the reredos which rises behind. The slab of stone or wood upon which the

sacred vessels are placed is called the "mensa," or table.

The Book of 1549 used both words in their liturgical sense.

"The Priest, standing humbly afore the midst of the Altar, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with this Collect." (Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open, etc.) "Then he shall say a Psalm appointed for the Introit."

Then follows the ninefold Kyrie.

"Then the Priest, standing at God's board, shall begin,

"Glory be to God on high."

The first of these rubrics directs the priest to stand at the accustomed place to say his private preparation, that is, at the foot of the altar steps, in the middle; but the last rubric tells him to stand on the uppermost step, at the mensa, or Lord's Table, or "God's board."

When our present Prayer Book orders the priest to "place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient," it gives an explicit direction that is perfectly clear. The Elements are to be placed upon the mensa, and not upon the gradine, or elsewhere. Again, some people have an idea that an altar must be a solid structure, or at least, that it must be enclosed all around, and that when the mensa rests upon pillars

or legs it is "merely a table." The solidity has nothing whatever to do with the matter. An altar may be solid or open under the mensa; it may be oblong, or square, or round, or polygonal; it may be fashioned of stone, or wood, or metal. If the Holy Eucharist be celebrated upon the structure, be its material, or size, or shape what it may, it is an altar. Many of the ancient altars were table-shaped, that is, a mensa resting upon pillars, or even brackets, and open underneath; and such a form is widely used in Roman Catholic churches at the present day. It is not the design of the structure, nor the workman's tool that makes the altar, but it is the offering of sacrifice that changes it from a table to an altar.

Note B.

The enactment of the Ornaments Rubric by Elizabeth has a value far beyond its bearing on the Prayer Book or the ceremonial of the Church. It completely disproves the oft repeated and oft refuted slander that "the Church of England was founded by Henry VIII."

When Mary came to the throne in 1553 she immediately set in motion the machinery that was to reconcile England and the Papal See. She summoned Parliament, and made known her wishes to that body, and in consequence an Act was passed repealing all laws concerning religion passed in the late reign. Next, "all married clergymen were to be removed and separated from their wives, and deprived of their benefices; but such as were willing to quit their wives might be promoted to other benefices, or might be entitled to a pension from the benefice of which they had been dispossessed."* Seven bishops and a considerable number of priests were deprived. Bishop Burnet greatly overestimates the number. The learned and accurate Henry Wharton estimates the number at less than a fourth of the whole sixteen thousand clergy of

* Carwithen's "History of the Church of England," p. 327.

the Church.* But whether the number were great or small has no bearing on the present question, for the point is that all bishops and priests were recognized as ecclesiastical persons, and the validity of ordinations under the Edwardine Ordinal was unquestioned. Hence the continuity of the Church, even under the crucial test of Orders, was undisputed.

The Queen then had Cardinal Pole, her cousin, brought back to England as Papal Legate. Pole had been attainted by Henry VIII. for contumacy and offences against the King, but Parliament now reversed the attainder, and restored to Pole his property and his rights as a subject. The Queen sent an embassy to the Pope offering the submission of England to the Holy See, and the Pope, in reply, commissioned Pole to grant absolution.

Certain conditions were exacted as the price of the absolution, and these Parliament observed with fidelity. "All laws enacted in prejudice to the Holy See since the twentieth year of Henry VIII. were repealed, but certain dispensations were asked: First, that all bishoprics, cathedrals, colleges, hospitals and schools, legally established since the schism, might be confirmed; secondly, that marriages contracted within such degrees as are not contrary to the laws of God might be con-

* Collier's "Eccl. Hist.," Vol. ii., c. 5.

firmed, and the issue declared legitimate; thirdly, that all institutions to benefices, and other ecclesiastical promotions, might be valid; fourthly, that all judicial processes in the Ecclesiastical Courts, made according to the laws of the realm, might be ratified; and fifthly, that all alienations of the lands belonging to any bishoprics, monasteries, or other religious houses, might continue as they were, without molestation."* †

The Cardinal granted a full confirmation of all these articles. In his speech to Parliament he said, "My commission is not to pull down, but to build; to reconcile, not to censure; to invite without compulsion. My business is not to proceed by way of retrospection, or to question things already settled. As for past errors, they shall be overlooked and forgotten; but to qualify yourselves for the pardon now offered, it is necessary to repeal those laws which have broken catholic unity, and divided you from the society of the Church."

When the terms of submission had been agreed upon, the Cardinal, with great pomp and solemnity, pronounced the papal absolution, and declared England reconciled to the Holy See.‡

By this act the Church of England was placed

* Carwithen.
† Stat. Philip and Mary, C. 8.
‡ "Life and Times of Cardinal Pole."—F. G. Lee. Miss Strickland's "Lives of the Queens of England," Queen Mary I.

by law exactly where she had been before Henry repudiated the Papacy, or took the first step toward ecclesiastical reform. Everything that Henry and Edward had done in the way of reform was wiped out, and the Church was accepted in 1554 as the same Church that existed in 1530. It had been in rebellion; that was all, but its organization was identical, its orders and sacraments were valid, its worship was catholic.

King Charles I., in his reply to Alexander Henderson, said, "No man, who truly understands the Reformation, will derive it from Henry the Eighth, for he only gave the occasion; it was his son who began, and Queen Elizabeth that perfected it."*

When Elizabeth came to the throne she was crowned by the Bishop of Carlisle, who held his see through the reign of Mary, and the ceremonial was according to the Roman pontifical. She began at once that policy of conciliation where conciliation was possible, that distinguished her whole reign. In the matter of religious changes she moved slowly and cautiously, and was careful to provoke as little dispute as possible. Royal Injunctions were issued, and Acts of Parliament were passed, and bishops and other clergy were commanded to subscribe to them and obey them. The Papacy was rejected, and the Sovereign's su-

* Rel. Sac. Carolinae, Vol. ii., p. 197. Hague, 1650.

premacy was declared, and all persons were required to submit to that supremacy in ecclesiastical as well as civil causes. Two hundred and forty-three bishops and other clergy refused to take the oath of the Royal Supremacy, and were accordingly deprived of their offices.* All the rest continued in their offices. These deprivations had no connection with religion; it was merely a question of loyalty to the crown. Many of the bishops who refused to take the Oath of Supremacy were suffered for a long time to retain possession of their sees.

With great wisdom and much care the Prayer Book was finally legalized and issued, and its use made obligatory. But here a difficulty arose, for the Book, compiled from the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, contained, like them, few ceremonial rubrics. The ancient ceremonial, re-established by Mary, was still in force, and it was found impossible to fit this, without modification, to the reformed Prayer Book. The famous "Ornaments Rubric" was therefore adopted. This made the needed connection and completed the circuit. It brought the current of the purified ceremonial of Edward to blend with the revised Book of Elizabeth, and thus to give to the Church a worship that is catholic and scriptural, free from superstition, and

* Neal's "History of the Puritans," Vol. I, c. iv.

adapted to the comprehension and needs of the people.

It is a matter of surprise that historians and controversialists have not emphasized and accentuated the Marian reconciliation with Rome; and this is to be regretted, because they lose a great opportunity to deal a deadly blow at the Romish invention of the origin of the English Church. The whole episode of Pole's mission to England is passed over with scant notice, as though it had no significance, and no real connection with the Reformation. It was a retrograde movement, it is true, but it was providentially ordered, for while it retarded the progress of the Reformation, it also checked the impetuous onward sweep of Calvinism. The ship of the Church recovered from the shock, and by the time she had righted herself the fierce power of Calvinism to mould the Church of England was spent.

But beyond this result Pole's mission was of value, for it shows very clearly what was the papal attitude toward the Church of England at that time. It is of comparatively little importance what that attitude may be at the present time, if, as is the case, the present hostility is based upon the alleged facts of the history of the middle and latter part of the sixteenth century. The figment of a Church founded by Henry VIII. does not fit in

with the Cardinal Legate's recognition of that Church as a part of the true Catholic Church in temporary schism. His acceptance of the five articles proposed by Parliament is the papal endorsement of the validity of Orders under the Edwardine Ordinal. It is of little consequence what the present Pope says about the validity of Anglican Orders as long as he bases his argument upon the supposed defects of our Ordinal. If one Pope can deny and overturn the deliberate decisions of a predecessor, and thus nullify his acts, then the papal opinion ceases to command respect.

If we examine the five articles we find that each and all acknowledge the catholicity of the Church, the validity of the orders of her ministers, and her right as a national Church to control her own affairs. The articles claim for the Church the power to erect dioceses and consecrate bishops for them, and to found cathedrals, schools and colleges. The marriages solemnized by her are not to be questioned, if not contracted within the forbidden degrees, and all institutions to benefices are to be recognized. Had the Pope refused all the dispensations but the last two, the case in favor of the Church could be closed, for it was held in those days that no marriage was legal, or even possible, unless solemnized by a priest. And as to institutions to benefices, every reader of history knows that for centuries it was a permanent cause

of conflict between the Papacy and every secular ruler. The claim was made by each successive pontiff that institution to benefices was a spiritual right, and the claim was often defended by the sword.

Akin to the disputes about institutions was that about courts for the trial of ecclesiastical causes. The chief conflict between the papal and civil powers was concerning the claim of the Roman See to exclusive jurisdiction over spiritual persons and causes. It was a quarrel that began before the days of S. Anselm, and had not slumbered a year in centuries. Yet Pole conceded the point and ratified the acts of the courts of the independent English Church during the reigns of Henry and Edward. If such courts were lawful then they are lawful now.

Even the alienation of Church lands was condoned, and permitted to continue, though Pole put it upon the consciences of the holders of such lands to make restitution either of the land or in a money equivalent.

Through all the transactions of Pole's mission there does not transpire a suggestion of heresy, or loss of catholicity, or lapsing of orders, or failure of sacraments during the period of separation. If these charges are to be brought against the Church they must be sought in her history after 1570, when the final break with Rome came.

Lit
3600.2
Ob2

Oberly, H. H.

The testimony of the Prayer Book to the continuity of the Church.

1915	CQ				
May 14	Print	May 25			
Dec		DEC			

~~2640.3~~ Lit
Ob2 3600.2
Ob2

17 DEC 1927